THE INDIAN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Edited by

NARENDRA NATH LAW

Vol. XX

CALCUTTA

1944

CONTENTS

Vol. XX (pp. 374)

ARTICLES

PAGE

Akbar's Philosophy of Life 53
By Prof. R. Krishnamurti, M.A.

British Policy towards the Afghan War of Succession (1863-68) 9, 143
By Prof. Anil Chandra Banerjee, M.A.

Buddha a Theist? 319
By L. B. Keny, M.A.

Constitution of the Licchavis of Vaiśālī 384
By Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D.

Date of Caitanya-Caritāmṛta of Murārigupta 132
By Biswaranjan Bhaduri, M.A.

Date of Vidyāpati 211
By Dr. Md. Shahidullah, M.A., D. Litt.

Doctrine of Doṣas in Sanskrit Poetics 217
By K. Krishna Moorty, M.A.

Early Industrial Organisation in North India 167
By Atindra Nath Bose, M.A.

Early Nineteenth Century Chinese Studies in Bengal ... 114
By Dr. Elmer H. Cutts, Ph.D.

Harikela and the Ruins at Maināmati 1
By Prof. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya, M.A.

Influence of Contemporary Sculpture on the Kannaḍa Poet Rudrabhaṭṭa 341
By N. Lakshminarayana Rao, M.A.

Kālibhanā Copper-plate Inscriptions of the Somavaṃśī King Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya 237
By Dr. D. C. Sircar, M.A., Ph.D. & P. C. Rath

Kingship and Kingly Administration in the Atharvaveda 105
By Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D.

Kingship in the Ṛg-veda 36
By Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D.

Medieval Narrative Bengali Poetry on Historical Themes 21
By Ashutosh Bhattacharyya, M.A.

Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kānyakubja and their Migration to Marwar 153
By M. L. Mathur, M.A.

Śivavilāsa 43
By Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.Phil.

Some Aspects of the Worship of Nārāyaṇa 275
By Nanimadhab Chaudhuri, M.A.

PAGE

Some NIA words from Apabhraṃśa 251
By Prof. Kalipada Mitra, M.A.

Story of a Trading Boat, 1793 301
By Dr. S. N. Sen, M.A., Ph.D., B. Litt.

Tirlingi Inscription of Devendravarman, son of Guṇārṇava: (Gaṅga) Year 192 232
By R. K. Ghoshal, M.A.

MISCELLANY

Chronology of the Reign of the Imperial Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II 72
By Prof. Dasaratha Sharma, M.A.

Date of Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta of Vilvamaṅgala 86
By H. G. Narahari, M.A., M. Litt.

Forged Purāṇa-text on the Imperial Guptas 345
By Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D

Kāca Problem 351
By Nalini Nath Das Gupta, M.A.

Kālibhanā Grants 364
By Dr. D. C. Sircar, M.A., Ph.D.

Laghuṣaṣṭha Variety of an Anuṣṭubh metre 365
By Prof. S. P. Chaturvedi, M.A.

Note on Coin of Rudravarma 59
By Rabis Chandra Kar, M.A.

Note on Genealogy of the Somavaṃśis 76
By Dr. D. C. Sircar, M.A., Ph.D.

Note on Pādānudhyāta 288
By Mm. Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M.A.

Note on Vajraṭa 353
By Mm. Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M.A.

Pāli Vedagū 29
By Dr. Baburam Saksena, M.A., D.Litt.

Rāmabhadras of Bengal 18
By Prof. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya, M.A.

Saṃgītacūḍāmaṇi of Jagadekamalla 8
By K. Madhava Krishna Sarma, M.A.

Side-light on the later Upaniṣadic Eschatology ... 57
By Prof. Jagadish Chandra Mitra, M.A.

Sixth and Seventh Syllables of an Anuṣṭubh Quarter... ... 8
By Dr. D. C. Sircar, M.A., Ph.D.

Subandhu of the Mauryan Times 8
By Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph.D.

PAGE

Subandhu's Vāsavadattanṛttadhāra 366
By Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., Ph.D.
Tibetan Translation of Prakriyā Kaumudī and the mention of Siddhānta Kaumudī therein 63
By Prof. Sujit Kumar Mukhopadhyaya, M.A.
Two white umbrellas secured by Dhruva 84
By Prof. Dasaratha Sharma, M.A.
Ubalike, Umbali, Unbali 285
By Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, M.A.
Vajraṭa 181
By Dr. N. Venkataramannya, M.A., Ph.D.
Vajraṭa and the 'Va' of the Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa ... 360
By Miss Krishnakumari J. Virji
Vasundharā, the Daughter of Vikrama 367
By D. B. Diskalkar, M.A.
Viṣṇu-stuti and Kṛṣṇa-Karṇāmṛta 179
By Dr. S. K. De, M.A., D.Litt.
REVIEWS: 89, 193, 293, 369
SELECT CONTENTS OF ORIENTAL JOURNALS: 96, 203, 298, 371
OBITUARY NOTICES:
Prof. Carlo Formichi 208
Prof. Heinrich Lüders 209
Theodor Ippolitorich Scherbatsky 102

PLATES

		Facing Page
Tekkali Plates of Devendravarman:	First Plate	234
,, ,, ,,	Second Plate, First side	234
,, ,, ,,	Second Plate, Second side	235
,, ,, ,,	Third Plate ...	235
Kālibhanā Grant of Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya —Year 6:	Pl. I, Second side	242
,, ,, ,,	Pl. II, First side	242
,, ,, ,,	Pl. II, Second side	243
,, ,, ,,	Pl. III, First side	243
,, ,, ,, —Year 34:	Pl. I, Second side	248
,, ,, ,,	Pl. II, First side	248
,, ,, ,,	Pl. II, Second side	249
,, ,, ,,	Pl. III, First side	249
Chain of destruction panel [Būcheśvara Temple at Koramaṅgala]		343

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

PAGE

Banerjee, Prof. Anil Chandra, M.A.
British Policy towards the Afghan War of Succession (1863-68) ... 9, 143

Bhaduri, Biswaranjan, M.A.
The Date of Caitanya-Caritāmṛta of Murāri Gupta ... 332

Bhattacharyya, Asutosh, M.A.
Medieval Narrative Bengali Poetry on Historical Themes 21

Bhattacharyya, Prof. Dinesh Chandra, M.A.
Harikela and the Ruins at Mainamati 1
Rāmabhadras of Bengal 188

Bose, Atindra Nath, M.A.
Early Industrial Organisation in North India ... 167

Chaturvedi, Prof. S. P., M.A.
Laghuṣaṣṭha Variety of an Anuṣṭubh metre ... 365

Chaudhuri, Nanimadhab, M.A.
Some Aspects of the Worship of Nārāyaṇa ... 275

Cutts, Dr. Elmer H., Ph.D.
Early Nineteenth Century Chinese Studies in Bengal 114

Das Gupta, Nalini Nath, M.A.
The Kāca Problem 351

De, Dr. S. K., M.A., D. Litt.
The Viṣṇu-stuti and Kṛṣṇa-Karṇāmṛta 179

Diskalkar, D. B., M.A.
Vasundharā, the Daughter of Vikrama 367

Ghoshal, R. K., M,A.
Tirlingi Inscription of Devendravarman, son of Guṇārṇava : (Gaṅga) Year 192 232

Ghoshal, Dr. U. N., M.A., Ph.D.
Constitution of the Licchavis of Vaiśālī 334
Kingship and Kingly Administration in the Atharvaveda 105
Kingship in the Ṛgveda 36

Kar, Rabis Chandra, M.A.
A Note on the Coin of Rudravarma 59

Keny, L. B., M.A.
Was Buddha a Theist ? 319

Krishnamurti, Prof. R., M.A.
Akbar's Philosophy of Life 53

Majumdar, Dr. R. C., M.A., Ph.D.
A forged Purāṇa-text on the Imperial Guptas ... 345

Mathur, M. L., M.A.
Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kānyakubja and their Migration to Marwar 153

PAGE

Mirashi, Mm. Prof. V. V., M.A.
A Note on Pādānudhyāta 288
A Note on Vajraṭa 353
Mitra, Prof. Jagadishchandra, M.A.
A Side-light on the later Upaniṣadic Eschatology ... 70
Mitra, Prof. Kalipada, M.A.
Some NIA Words from Apabhraṃśa 251
Moorty, K. Krishna, M.A.
The Doctrine of Doṣas in Sanskrit Poetics ... 217
Mukhopadhyaya, Prof. Sujitkumar, M.A.
Tibetan Translation of Prakriyā Kaumudī and the Mention of Siddhānta Kaumudī therein 63
Narahari, H. G., M.A., M. Litt.
On the Date of Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta of Vilvamaṅgala ... 86
Raghavan, Dr. V., M.A., Ph.D.
Subandhu of the Mauryan Times 85
Subandhu's Vāsavadattanṛttadhāra 366
Raja, Dr. C. Kunhan, M.A., D. Phil.
Śivavilāsa 43
Rao, N. Lakshminarayana, M.A.
Influence of Contemporary Sculpture on the Kannaḍa Poet Rudrabhaṭṭa 341
Rath, P. C. & Sircar, Dr. D.C., M.A., Ph.D.
Kālibhanā Copper-plate Inscriptions of the Somavaṃśī King Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya ... 237
Saksena, Dr. Baburam, M.A., D. Litt.
Pāli Vedagū 290
Sarma, K. Madhava Krishna, M.A.
Saṃgītacuḍāmaṇi of Jagadekamalla 87
Sastri, Prof. K. A. Nilakanta, M.A.
Ubalike, Umbali, Unbali 285
Sen, Dr. S. N., M.A., Ph.D., B. Litt.
The Story of a Trading Boat, 1793 301
Shahidullah, Dr. Md., M.A., D. Litt.
The Date of Vidyāpati 211
Sharma, Prof. Dasaratha, M.A.
Cronology of the Reign of the Imperial Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II 72
Two white Umbrellas secured by Dhruva 84
Sircar, Dr. D. C., M.A., Ph.D.
A Note on the Genealogy of the Somavaṃśis ... 76
Kālibhanā Grants 364
The Sixth and Seventh Syllables of an Anuṣṭubh quarter 82

	PAGE
Sircar, Dr. D. C., M.A., Ph.D. & I th, P. C.	
Kālibhanā Copper-plate Inscriptions of the Somavaṃśī King Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya ...	237
Venkataramanyya, Dr. N., M.A., Ph.D.	
Vajraṭa	181
Virji, Miss Krishnakumari	
Vajraṭa and the 'Va' of the Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa ...	360

INDEX

Abdur Rahman Khan, son of Afzal Khan, 145f. ; flight of, 146f., revolt of, 149ff.; Sher Ali's treaty with, 150;

Abhinavagupta, nṛttavāra cited by, 366

Advaita, elder contemporary of Caitanya, 216

Afghan war of succession (1863-68), British Policy towards, 9ff, 143ff.

Afzal Khan, Azim Khan's relation with, 150f.; confinement and release of, 145 ff.; revolt of, 143ff.; ruler of Kabul, 151ff.; Sher Ali Khan's contest with, 13f.

Akbar, theology conceived by, 53f. prayers, rituals and worships in life of, 57f.; *San* era introduced by, 212

Ālam Shāh, king of Delhi, 215

Alaṃkāramahodadhi, work of Narendraprabhāsūri, 86

Ali Vardi, Nawab of Bengal, Bhāskara killed by, 25f.

Allahabad Pillar inscr., Samudragupta mentioned as appointed king by his father in, 347

Amin Khan, Governor of Kandahar, revolt of, 9ff.

Amoghavarṣa, white umbrellas mentioned in Sañjan Plates of, 84f.

Ānandavardhana (Sanskrit poet), doctrine of *doṣas* as understood by, 226

Andre Bartolomeu, Da 'Cruz, Portuguese Captain, account of commercial cruise of, 301ff.; letters of, 309ff.

Andhras, Candragupta captured kingdom of Magadha from, 346, 352

Andhra-bhaṛtyas, Guptas identified with, 346, 351

Anudhyāta, meaning of, 288f.

Anuṣṭubh Quarter, Sixth and Seventh syllables of, 82f. Laghu-ṣaṣṭha variety of, 365f.

Apabhraṃśa, as literary language, 252ff.; different forms of, 253; similarity between deśa-bhāṣās and, 253; some NIA words from, 251ff. similarity of Bengali and Hindī words to those of, 252ff.

Arjuna Siṃha, king of Mithilā, 212

Aśokāditya, son of Candra-gupta, and ruler of Magadha, 346

Atharvaveda, kingship and kingly administration in, 105; official titles in, 112f.

Avanijanāśraya Pulakeśin, ruler of Gujarat, dates of plates of, 289

Avanivarman Yoga, son of Balavarman, Copper-plate Inscr. of, 73f.

Azim Khan, ruler of Kabul, 150ff; Sher Ali Khan's contest with, 12f.

Bajgab, battle of, 143f.

Bālāditya, title of Narasiṃhagupta, 347

Balijhari Inscr., Mahā-Sivagupta II mentioned in, 79

Baptist Missionary Society, 119ff.

Bauddha Gān O Dohā, 252; date and language of, 255

Begumra Plates of Indrarāja III, two white umbrellas mentioned in, 84f,

Bengal, early Chinese studies in, 114ff.; early Christian Missionary activities in, 114ff.; Mahratta invasion of, 22; Rāmabhadras of, 188ff.

Bhāgavatas, Pañcarātras as distinguished from, 281, rise of, 282ff.

Bhairavendra (Harinārāyaṇa), brother of Dhīra Siṃha, 213

Bhāmaha (author of Kāvyālaṅkāra), *doṣas* as conceived by, 218ff.

Bharata, author of Nāṭyaśāstra, *doṣas* as conceived by, 217.

Bhāratacandra, poet, 27ff.; authenticity of accounts given by, 30ff.

Bharukaccha, as capital of the Gurjaras, 357; Dharasena IV's camp at, 358

Bhāskara, Bengal invaded by, 22ff.

Bhāskara-parābhava, story in, 22ff.; historicity of facts told in, 26f.
Bhaṭṭa Utpala, commentator, Vaimaka tribe mentioned by, 61f.
Bhaṭṭārka, general of Kumāragupta II, 347, 349
Bhaṭṭoji Dīkṣita, author of Siddhānta-kaumudī, 67
Bhaveśa, same as Bhava Siṃha, brother of king Bhogīśvara, 213
Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa, unreliability of historical statements in, 345-350
Bhoja, grandson of Nāgabhaṭa II, 73; Gwalior inscr. of, 74; Sanskrit poet, *doṣa* as treated by, 231
Bhūparikramā, work of Vidyāpati, 213
Bible, Chinese translation of, 118ff.
Bilvamaṅgala, author of Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta, 86f.
Brahmā, Buddhist and Brahmanical conceptions of, 325 ff.
Budāūn Stone Inscr., rulers of Kanauj referred in, 155
Budhagupta, son of Pūrugupta, 348
Buddha, whether he was theist, 319ff.
Buddharāja (Kalaccuri king), 182, 185,. conflict between Maṅgaleśa and, 360
Buddhism, doctrine of Karma in, 321 ff; fundamental doctrines of, 319ff; conception of nirvāṇa in, 323f; spread of, 319; transmigration according to, 325f;
Caitanya-caritāmṛta, work of Murāri Gupta, date of, 132ff,
Cakrāyudha, ruler of Kanauj, defeat of, 72ff.; successor of Indrāyudha, 186
Cālukyas, North Indian expeditions of, 353 ff; 360 ff.
Cālukyas of Bādāmi, enemies of, 181; dominions of, 182; northern expeditions of, 182ff.
Caṇḍīdāsa, meeting of Vidyāpati with, 216
Candradeva, Gāhaḍavāla prince, 158, 163
Candradvīpa, kingdom of, 3
Candragupta, Licchavis and king of Nepal connected by matrimony with, 346, 352; son of Ghatotkaca, and king of Magadha, 345f.
Candragupta I, reign period of. 349
Candragupta II Vikramāditya, son of Aśokāditya, king, 346, Vikrama of Kṛtyakalpataru identified with, 367
Candrapāla, ruler of Asi, 161
Candra Siṃha (Rūpanārāyaṇa), brother of Dhīra Siṃha, 213
Candraśrī Sātakarṇī, son of Vāśiṣṭha, 345, 352; Candragupta married sister-in-law of, 346
Carey, Chinese studies begun by, 120ff.
Candāwar, battle of, 164
Candellas, rise of, 159f.; fall of, 161 f.
Charles Grant, English education in India advocated by, 115
Chinese Studies, activities of English Missionaries for, 116 ff.
Claudius Buchanan, interest taken in English and Chinese education in Bengal by, 116 ff.
Cleisthenian constitution, character of, 335, 338
Cornwallis, Governor General, 115 f.
Dadda II Praśāntarāga, last known date of, 358
Dadda III Bāhusahāya, successor of Jayabhaṭa II, 358
Dāmodara, author of Śivavilāsa, 43 f. companion of Caitanya, 133 f.; king, 215
Dānavākyāvalī, work of Vidyāpati, 213
Daṇḍin (author of Kāvyādarśa), doṣas as treated by, 220 ff.
Dantidurga, ruler, 181
Darpanārāyaṇa, son of Hari Siṃha, 213
Dasht Soofaid, battle of, 144
David Brown, disciple of Joseph Milner, 115 f.
Dāyabhāgaṭīkā, work of Rāmabhadra Nyāyālaṅkāra, 188 ff.
Death, three stages after, 70
Depung, monastery of Tibet, 64 fn.
Deśya words, meaning of, 256

Devasiṃha, king of Mithila, date of death of, 212
Devendravarman (son of Guṇārṇava), Tirliṅgi Inscr. of, 232 ff.
Devu, astrologer, 246
Dhanapāla, Apabhraṃśa writer, date of, 251
Dhāra Datta, minister for peace and war, 246
Dhāra Datta II (minister) son of Malla Datta, 78
Dharasena IV, 361, 363; land grants issued by, 358
Dharāśraya Jayasiṃha, son of Pulakesin II, 353 ff; date of Nasik plate of, 354, 363
Dhrmapāla, ruler of Bengal, defeat of, 72ff.
Dhīrā Devī, queen of Narasiṃha Deva (Darpanārāyaṇa), 213
Dhīra Siṃha, son of Darpanārāyaṇa, 213, 215
Dhruva, insignias of royalty snatched from Vatsarāja by, 84f.
Dhruvadevī, queen of Candragupta, 347
Dhruvasena III, successor of Dharasena IV, 361, 363
Dohākoṣa, work of Kṛṣṇācāryapāda, 252
Doṣas, doctrine of, 217ff.
Durgābhaktitaraṅgiṇī, work of Vidyāpati, 213
Early Industrial Organization (in Northern India), origin of, 167f., development of, 168; structure of, 168ff.
Fort William, College of, 116f.
French, English and Dutch fought against, 302f.
Gaganeśvara, son of Bhogīśvara, 214
Gaṇḍabheruṇḍa, double-headed eagle, used as royal insignia and sculptural motif, 341ff.
Gaṅgārām, poet, 22, 26ff.
Gaṅgāvākyāvalī, work of Vidyāpati, 213
Gautama, six Buddhas previous, to 328
Ghataker Puthi, genealogical work, 29
God, Buddha's silence about, 326ff.
Gopāla, ruler of Kanauj, date of, 158f.
Govinda III, Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler, Nāgabhaṭa II defeated by, 72 ff.
Govinda Candra, son of Madanapāla, 157f.
Guilds, activities of, 177; apportionment of shares and liabilities among members of, 172 f., disputes and arbitration of,. 175, evolution of, laws of, 172, powers and functions of, 177f,; finance of, 174f., industries organised into, 176f., judicial authority of 173f., 176, militia of, 176; state's relation with, 175f.
Guṇarahasya, work of Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma, 191
Gupta Kings, Purāṇic account of, 345ff.
Gurjaras, capital of, 357fn.; Maitrakas of Valabhī, invaded kingdom of, 358
Haimavatas, Buddhist School, 64fn.
Harikela, literary references to, 1ff., location of, 1ff., mentioned in epigraphic records, 3f., ruins at Maināmati and, 1ff.
Harivaṃśa, king Indrāyudha mentioned in, 186
Henom (Yanam), captured by the English, 304
Hoysala architecture, feature of, 341f.
Imperial Guptas, a forged Purāṇa text on, 345ff.
Indrāyudha, king of Kanauj, 186
Iśānavarman, defeated by Kumāra-Gupta II, 347
I-tsing, Harikela mentioned by, 1
Jagadekamalla, Cālukya king of Kalyan, 87
Jambugrāma, same as mod. Jāmgāon, 240
Jatesinga-Dungri Inscr., Mahā-Sivagupta mentioned in, 77ff.
Jaycandra, king of Kanauj defeated by Sahabuddin Ghorī, 153, 163f.
Jayabhaṭa III, son of Dadda III, Navsāri plates of, 358f.
Jayāśraya-Maṅgalarasarāja, date of grant of, 289
Jhan Pascal, commander of 'Denmarca', 303

Jhansi Stone Inscr., rulers of Kānyakubja referred to in, 154f.
Jinadattasūri, Apabhraṃśa writer, 255
Jinendra, Pope-king of Tibet, 64f.
Joannes Lasser, translator of Armenian Bible into Chinese, 117ff.
Kāca, identity of, 349; son of Candragupta by Licchavi wife, 346, 352f.
Kālibhanā Copper-plate Inscrs., date of, 237f; donees of, 240, 246; grants recorded in, 239, 245; language of, 238, 245; localities mentioned in, 240f, 246f; officers and others mentioned in, 239, 246; palaeography and orthography of, 238, 245; texts of 241ff, 247ff; writers and engravers of, 240, 246, discussion on date and script of, 364
Kaliṅganagara, identification of, 234
Kaliyugavṛttānta, (part of Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa) forged text of, 349ff; story of the Guptas in, 345ff., 351; Sthiragupta Prakāśāditya mentioned as father of Narasiṃhagupta Bālāditya in, 347, 349
Kāmeśvara dynasty, genealogical table of, 214
Kaṃśanārāyaṇa, same as Dhīra Siṃha, 215
Kanauj, Rāṣṭrkūṭa rule over, 153f.; chronology of later Rāṭhor rulers of, 163 f.; migration of Rāṭhors from, 164
Kāntideva, Harikela referred to in copper-plate of, 3
Kānyakubja, Rāṣṭrakūṭas of, 153ff.
Karan, Cedi king, 154, 158f.
Karikal, captured by the English, 303
Karma, Buddhist doctrine of, 320ff.
Karpūramañjarī, king Vajrāyudha mentioned in, 186
Kātantra, reference in Prakriyākaumudī, 67
Kaurama, king of Ruśāmas, 105
Kavīkarṇapūra, Caitanya's life as recorded by, 135ff.
Kavi Sekhara, Bengali Poet, 215,
Kesarkella grant, script of, 364
Kingship, Ṛgvedic data about, 36-42, Atharvaveda supplying information about, 105-113
Kīrtilatā, work of Vidyāpati, 211, 213, 252
Kīrtipatākā, work of Vidyāpati, 213
Kīrtivarman, Candella ruler, 158
Kīrtivarman I, Cālukya ruler, 182
Konnayillā, identification, 246
Koramaṅgala, sculpture of 'chain of destruction' in Bucheśvar temple at, 343
Korasoḍaka-pañcāli, identified with mod. Koroshaṇḍā in Orissa, 234
Kṛṣṇa Devakīputra, pupil of Ghora Āṅgirasa, 279
Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta, date of, 86f.; Narendraprabhasūri quotes from, 86f.; Viṣṇustuti and, 179 ff.
Kṛṣṇadāsa-Kavirāja, author of Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, 134 f.
Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, Epic deity, 275; son of Devakī, 279
Kṛtyakalpataru, work of Lakṣmīdhara, two missing sections of, 367
Kṣatra, relations between Brahma and, 109
Kumāradevī, queen of Candragupta, 346; Sarnāth Inscr. of Govinda Candra mentions, 157
Kumāra Gupta, son of Candra Gupta Vikramāditya, 347
Kumāragupta II, son of Narasiṃha Gupta, king, 347
Kuntaka (Sanskrit poet), poetry as defined by, 227f; doṣas according to, 229
Kunwar Seta, father of Rao Sihāji, 164 fn.
Kusumāñjali Vyākhyā, work of Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma, 191 f.
Lakhanapāla, Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler, 163f.
Lakṣmī Nātha, date of, 214f.
Licchavis (of Vaiśālī), constitution of, 334 ff.
Likhanāvalī, work of Vidyāpati, 212, 213
Locana, author of Caitanyamaṅgala, 135
Lun-yü, publication of trans. and text of, 122 f.

Madanapāla, date of, 156
Madanavarman, Mau Stone Inscr. of, 162 fn.
Magadha, Candra Gupta I as ruler of, 348
Mahā-Bhavagupta 1 Janamejaya, Somavaṃśī ruler, 76 ff., 364; identified with Mahā-Bhavagupta of Kesarkella Inscr., 364.; Kālibhanā copper-plate Inscrs. of, 237 ff.
Mahā-Bhavagupta II, Somavaṃśī ruler, 76 ff.
Mahāpurāṇa, Apabhraṃśa work of Puṣpadanta, 251
Mahā-Śivagupta I Yajāti, Somavaṃśī ruler, 76 ff.
Mahendrāditya, title of Kumāragupta, 347
Mahimabhaṭṭa, author of Vyaktiviveka, doṣas as classified by, 230
Mahmud, invasion of India by, 160f.
Maināmati, ruins at, 1ff.
Malla Datta (minister), son of Dhāra Datta, 78
Mammaṭa, author of Kāvyaprakāśa, doṣas as treated by, 231f.
Mānasiṃha Kāvya, work of Bhāratcandra, historical aspect of, 27ff.
Maṅgala Kāvyas, conventions of, 21f.
Maṅgalīśa, king of Bādāmi, 182, 185; Buddharāja defeated by, 182
Maṇimarīci, lost work of Jānakīnātha Bhaṭṭācārya Cūḍāmaṇi, 191f.
Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, Gupta chronology in, 361ff.; North Indian king named with initial letter 'va' mentioned in, 186f., Śrī Parvata mentioned in, 351f.; Vajraṭa mentioned as 'va' in, 353, 359f.
Mānyakheta (mod. Malkhed), capital of king Amoghavarṣa, 251
Marshman, Chinese grammar of, 128f.; Chinese studies begun by, 120ff.
Marwar, immigration of Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kānyakubja to, 153 ff.
Masud III, Moslem king, Kanauj invaded by, 156 f.
Meharauli Pillar Inscr., king Candra of, 349
Middle country, limits of, 319
Mitchell, English resident at Nagore and Negapatam, 302 ff.
Morrison, Chinese grammar of, 128
Mugdhabodha, Prakriyā-Kaumudī referred to, 67
Muktāvathi, identification of, 247
Murāri Gupta, author of Caitanya-Caritāmṛta, 132; date of, 137 f.
Murasīman, Mursing identified with, 240
Nāgabhaṭa II, dates of accession and death of, 74f.; Pratihāra ruler, chronology of reign of, 72ff.
Namisadhu, Apabhraṃśa writer, 253
Nara, Nārāyaṇa associated with, 276ff.
Nara-Nārāyaṇa, battle between Rudra and, 178
Narasiṃhagupta, son of Sthiragupta Prakāśāditya, 347
Nārāyaṇa, association of Nara with, 276ff; forms of devotion to, 280; incarnatory forms of, 280; described as Pañcarātrika, 280f; relation between Viṣṇu and, 282f., Ṛgvedic ṛṣi and author of Puruṣasūkta, 275, 282; worship of, 275ff.; cosmic character of, 276ff.
Nārāyaṇa Hari, Supreme Deity, 279
Nāsik Plates, Vajraṭa identified with Vajraḍa of, 353f; 357, 363
Nasira Shāh, identification of, 215; king of Delhi, 215
Nāṭyadarpaṇa, Vāsavadattānṛttavāra found in, 366
Negapatam, Da' Cruz's arrival at, 302f.
Nerur grant, description of Vijayāditya's expedition to Northern India in, 355f. 360f.
Nirvāṇa, meaning of, 323ff.
North India, early industrial organization in, 167ff.; Cālukya invasion of, 182ff.
Nyāyarahasya, work of Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma, 190
Occupation, heredity of, 170f.
Pādānudhyāta, note on, 288ff.

Padāvalī, work of Vidyāpati, 211; personages mentioned in, 213ff.
Pakṣadhara Miśra, logician, Vidyāpati contemporary of, 216
Pallavas, Cālukyas invaded by, 184f.
Pañcarātra system, sātvatavidhi identical with, 280
Pāṇini, four commentaries on, 66
Parākramāditya, title of Skanda Gupta, 347
Parikṣit, king of Kurus, 105
Poetry, defects and excellences of, 217ff.
Pondichery, date of British occupation of, 307
Porāṇavajjidhamma, 339f.
Potā Viṣaya, mod. Pow identified with, 240
Prabhāvatī, Vākāṭaka queen, identification of Vasundharā of Kṛtyakalpataru with, 367
Prajāpati, Puruṣa identified with, 276
Prakriyā-kaumudī similarities between Siddhāntakaumudī and, 67; Tibetan translation of, 63ff.;
Prāṇakṛṣṇīyaśabdābdhi, work of Raghumaṇi Vidyābhuṣaṇa, 190
Pratihāras, Dharmapāla's struggle with, 73f.
Pūga, difference of Śreṇī from, 167
Pulakesin II, nephew and successor of Maṅgalīśa, 183, 185; king Harṣa defeated by, 183
Srī Harṣa, king of Kanoj, 181,183,185
Puloman, son of Candraśrī, 345 f, 352
Purāditya, king, 212, 213
Purāṇas, account of Kaliyugavṛttānta differs from, 348
Pūru Gupta, father of Narasiṃhagupta, 349f.
Puruṣa, attributes of, 275; Nārāyaṇa identical with, 276
Puruṣaparīkṣā, work of Viyapati, 213
Puṣpadanta, writer in Apabhraṃśa, 251
Rādhanpur Plates of Govinda III two white umbrellas mentioned in, 84f.
Rahan Inscr., Govinda Candra's fight with Muhammadans mentioned in, 157
Ṛgveda, kingship in, 36 ff.; king's functions in, 39f.
Rājaśekhara, poet, king Vajrāyudha mentioned by, 186
Rājya, conception of, 108f.
Rājyapāla, ruler of Kanauj, 160
Rājyavardhana, elder brother and predecessor of king Harṣa, 187
Rāmabhadra, son of Nāgabhaṭa II, 75
Rāmabhadra Nyayālaṃkāra, author of Dāyabhāgaṭikā, 188ff.
Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma, son of Bhaṭṭācārya Cūḍāmaṇi and author of Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī, 190
Rāmabhadra Siddhāntavāgīśa, grandson of Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra, 192
Rāmacandra, author of Prakriyākaumudī, 65ff.
Rāmpāl plate (of Śrī Candra), Harikela mentioned in, 3
Rao Sihāji, grandson of Lakhanpāla and founder of Marwar Raṭhors, 153, 164f.
Rāṣtra, conception of, 108f.
Rāṣṭrakūṭas, migration of, 153ff; Nāgabhaṭa II's struggle with, 73f.
Rāṭhors, descent of, 153f.
Reviews—Ancient Vijñaptipatras; 90; Annexation of Burma, 93; Aurangzeb, 369; Beginnings of Indian Historiography and other Essays, 293; Bṛhatkathākoṣa of Hariseṇa, 369; Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, vol. V: V. S. Sukthankar Memorial Volume, 193; Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts, vol. I, 201; Early Aryans in Gujarata, 293; History of Gingee and its Rulers, 202; Important Inscriptions from the Baroda State, 296; Jñāna-dīpikā, 193, 295; Last Peshwa and the English Commissioners, 369; Law of War and Peace in Islam, 89; Liṅgadhāraṇacandrikā of Nandikeśvara, 94; Philosophy of Aesthetic Pleasure, 199; Rajput Studies, 93; Śrī-Venkaṭeśakāvyakalpa, 200; Sukthankar Memorial Edition, vol. I, Critical

Studies in the Mahābhārata, 193; Tiloya-Pannatti of Yativrṣabhācārya 201, Topographical List of Travancore Inscriptions, 91; Usāniruddham, 200.
Rudrabhaṭṭa, Kannaḍa poet, influence of contemporary sculpture on, 341ff.
Rudra Datta, minister, 78
Rudra Siṃha, contemporary of Gadādhara, 214
Rudraṭa (author of Kāvyālaṅkāra), 253; doṣas as treated by, 225
Rudravarma, note on coin of, 59ff.
Rummindei Inscr, meaning of Ubalike in, 285
Rūpacintāmaṇi, lexicon composed by Yādavānanda Dāsa, 6
Rūpamālā, work of Vimalasarasvatī, 67
Rūpāvatāra, work of Dharmakīrti, 67
Sādhāraṇa, Brāhmaṇa minister of Mahā-Bhavagupta I, 246
Sāhet Mahat Inscr., Gopāla and his son Madana mentioned in, 156, 158, 160 fn.
Śaivasarvasāra, work of Vidyāpati, 213
Sallakṣaṇavarman, son and successor of Kīrti-Varman, 162 fn,
Śambhuvākyāvalī, work of Vidyāpati, 213
Saṃgītacūḍūmaṇī, work of Jagadekamalla, 87
Samudragupta, not a parricide, 347
San era, introduction of, 212
Sandracottas, identification of, 345
Sañjan Plates of Amoghavarṣa I, two white umbrellas mentioned in, 84f.
Sanskrit Poetics, Doctrine of Doṣas in, 217 ff.
Sātvatas, god and mode of worship of, 281
Serampore, activities of Baptist Press at, 123 ff.
Siddhānta-kaumudī, mentioned in Tib. tr. of Prakriyā-kaumudī, 63
Śīlāditya, as conventional name of all Valabhī kings, 359
Śīlāditya III (of Valabhī) Gurjara country occupied by, 357 f.; contemporaneity of Dharasena IV with, 358; Vajraṭa identified with, 359
Siṃha Datta, minister, 78
Sircail, Harikela identical with, 7 f.
Śivagupta, Somavaṃśī ruler, 76 ff.
Siva Siṃha, king, copper-plate grant of, 212
Sivavilāsa, semi-historical poem, 43ff.; story of a Deccan king in, 45ff.
Shāh Husain, identification and reign of, 215
Sher Ali, British attitude towards, 150 f; defeat of, 151
Sher Ali Khan, Amir of Afganistan, hostile sirdars checked by, 9 ff.; British alliance with, 9 ff.
Shih-li-ch'a-to-lo, identification of, 7f.
Skandagupta Parākramāditya, son of Kumāragupta, 347, reign period of, 348
Somavaṃśīs, date of, 80ff., genealogy of, 76 ff.
Somavaṃśī charters, peculiarities of, 238 ff.
South Kosala, Pāṇḍuvaṃśīs of, 76, 80
Śreṇī, *pūga* distinguished from, 167
Śrī Harṣa, king of Kanauj, conflict between Pulakeśin II and, 360
Śrī-Parvata, location and identity of, 351 f., Guptas' original kingdom in, 348
Śrī Pārvatīya Andhrabhṛtyas, Guptas identified with, 346 f., 351
Śryāśraya, son of Jayasiṃha, 288 f.
Subandhu, Mauryan minister, 85; note on, 366
Śuka, Epic sage, 70 f.
Surtan Gyāsa Deva, identification of, 215
Suvarṇapura, mod. Sonepur identified with, 246
Tirliṅgi Incr. of Devendravarman (Gaṅga year 192), 232 ff; findspot of, 232; description of, 232 f.; characters of, 233; date of, 233 f; orthography of, 233; language of, 233; donor and donees of, 233 f; place-names in, 234; text of, 234-236
Tīrthamaṅgala, historical poem, 34 f.

Trading Boat, story of, 301 ff.
Trairājya-Pallava, ruler, 185
Tranquebar, Danish settlement, 303
Tribhuvanapāla, son of Madanapāla, 158, 163
Trikaliṅga, country, location of, 80, 241; extension of, 364
Ṭokkārā, identification of, 246
Turuṣka Daṇḍa, tax, 162
Ubalike, derivation and meaning of, 285 ff.
Umbali or Unbali, Aśokan term Ubalike traced in, 286 f.
Upaniṣadic Eschatology (later), side-light on, 70 ff.
Utbi, Moslem writer, 161
Va, as initial letter of a ruler's name in Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, 187 f; same as Vajraṭa, 188
Vāhlikas, conquered by Candragupta Vikramāditya, 347, 349
Vaiśālī, constitution of the Licchavis of, 334 ff.
Vaiyāmakas (tribe), Vemakas identified with, 60 f.
Vajra, son of Bhānugupta, 362
Vajraṭa, 181 ff.; another name of Śīlāditya III, 359; note on, 353 ff.; date of, defeat of, 355 ff.; 363; conflict between Cālukyas and, 360
Vajrāyudha, king of Kanauj, referred to by Rājaśekhara, 186; king of Pañcāla, Vajraṭa identical with, 353, 357, 359
Vāmadeva, Ṛgvedic seer, 70f.
Vāmana, doṣas as treated by, 222ff.
Vāsavadattānṛttavāra of Subandhu, Abhinavagupta's illustration for Bandha from, 366
Vasu Uparicara, king, worship of Nārāyaṇa by, 279ff.
Vāsudeva, Nārāyaṇa same as, 282f.
Vāsudeva-Kavikaṅkaṇa Cakravartī, smṛti writer, 6f.
Vasundharā, Vikrama's daughter, 367f.
Vāṭāi, Capital City, 184
Vedagū, Pali word, derivation and meanings of, 290ff.
Vedic kingship, origin of, 36 f.; limitations of, 41
Vemaka (tribe), Vaimakas and Vaiyāmakas identified with, 60f.
Vibhāgasāra, work of Vidyāpati, 213
Vidyādhara, Chandella ruler, 161
Vidyāpati, date of, 211 ff.; genealogical table of ancestors of, 216f.; works of, 213
Vijaya Dasanapura, Vākāṭaka capital, Daśārṇa of Kṛtyakalpataru, identified with, 367
Vijayāditya, son of Vinayāditya, 353, 360f.; title of Candragupta, 346
Vijayāditya Satyāśraya, son of Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya and grandson of Vikramāditya I, 183, 185
Vijayarāma Sen, author of Tīrthamaṅgala, 35
Vikrama (or Vikramāditya), as epithet of Indian rulers, 368
Vikramāditya, title of Candragupta, 346
Vikramāditya I, grandfather of Vijayāditya, 355; son and successor of Pulakeśin II, 183
Vinayāditya, Cālukya ruler, 353, 360f; son of Vikramāditya I, 183ff.;
Vinītapura, mod. Binka, 79 f.
Viṣṇu, Vedic deity, 275
Viṣṇustuti, date of manuscript of, 180; different from Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta, 180; work of Bilvamaṅgala, 179
Viśvās Devī, widow of king Padma Siṃha, 213
Vodāmyuta, town, Siva temple at, 156
Vrācaṭa or Vrācaḍa, dialect of the Ābhīras, 253f.
Wellesley, Governor-General, Fort William College established by, 116f.
Wu-hing (or Prajñādeva), a Buddhist priest, 1f.
Yādavānanda Dāsa, author of Rūpacintāmaṇi, 6
Yayātinagara, city, 79

CONTENTS

PAGE

Harikela and the Ruins at Mainamati 1
By Prof. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya, M.A.

British Policy towards the Afghan War of Succession (1863-68) 9
By Prof. Anilchandra Banerjee, M.A.

Medieval Narrative Bengali Poetry on Historical Themes ... 21
By Asutosh Bhattacharyya, M.A.

Kingship in the Ṛgveda 36
By Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., PH.D.

Śivavilāsa 43
By Dr. C. Kunhan Raja, M.A., D.PHIL.

Akbar's Philosophy of Life 53
By Prof. R. Krishnamurti, M.A.

Miscellany:

A Note on the Coin of Rudravarma 59
By Rabis Chandra Kar, M.A.

Tibetan Translation of Prakriyā Kaumudī and the Mention of Siddhānta Kaumudī therein 63
By Prof. Sujitkumar Mukhopadhyaya, M.A.

A Side-light on the later Upaniṣadic Eschatology 70
By Prof. Jagadishchandra Mitra, M.A.

Chronology of the Reign of the Imperial Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II 72
By Prof. Dasharatha Sharma, M.A.

A Note on the Genealogy of the Somavaṃśis 76
By Dr. Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A., PH.D.

The Sixth and Seventh Syllables of an Anuṣṭubh Quarter ... 82
By Dr. Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A., PH.D.

Two white Umbrellas secured by Dhruva 84
By Prof. Dsharatha Sharma, M.A.

Subandhu of the Mauryan Times 85
By Dr. V. Raghavan, M.A., PH.D.

On the Date of Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta of Vilvamaṅgala 86
By H. G. Narahari, M.A., M.LITT.

Saṃgītacūḍāmaṇi of Jagadekamalla 87
By K. Madhava Krishna Sarma, M.A.

Reviews:

The Law of War and Peace in Islam 89
By Dr. A. F. M. Khalilur Rahman, B.A. (Hons.), PH.D. (Lond.).
Ancient Vijñaptipatras 90
Topographical List of Travancore Inscriptions 91
By Dr. Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A., PH.D.
Annexation of Burma 93
Rajput Studies 93
By Dr. Narendra Krishna Sinha, M.A., PH.D.
Liṅgadhāraṇacandrikā of Nandikeśvara 94
By Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti, M.A.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals: 96

Obituary Notice:

Th. Scherbatsky 102
By Dr. P. V. Bapat, M.A., PH.D.

The Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. XX **March, 1944** **No. 1**

Harikela and the Ruins at Mainamati[1]

No serious attempt seems to have yet been made by scholars to fix the position of the ancient kingdom of Harikela, though the Chinese accounts glorify it as containing the most celebrated seat of Buddhist learning in Eastern India next to Nālandā. The main site of this long lost university—practically the only one of considerable celebrity in Bengal proper—must be lying buried in one of the districts of Eastern Bengal entirely forgotten by the people.

In Julien's edition of *Hiuen Tsang* (1858, vol. II) there is an ancient map of Central Asia and India, originally published in Japan in 1710, which gives the position of Harikela to the south of Tāmralipta, east of Utkala and south-west of Samataṭa. This is against all other accounts. The earliest mention of Harikela, as far as available to us, is that by the Chinese traveller I-tsing in his second work—'Memoirs of Eminent Priests who visited India'. A summary of this work is given in the Introduction to Beal's *Life of Hiuen Tsang*. Three of these priests came to Harikela, one of whom an aged Bhikṣu won the respects of the king of that place and was the pontiff of a Vihāra there; he died and was buried at Harikela, where he had collected a large number of Mss. and images. The account, however, of another Chinese pilgrim named Wu-hing or Prajñādeva, the Dhyāna master, whom I-tsing actually met in India in the year 685 A.D. (Takakusu: Intro. xxxiii) gives some clue to the actual position of the

1 The first part of this paper was written for the Sixth Oriental Conference held at Patna in 1930; as the writer could not attend the Conference the paper was neither read nor published. *Vide Proceedings*, p. xvii: the paper was entitled 'The lost kingdom of Harikela.' A copy of the paper was given on request to Mr. B. N. Sarkar B.A., C.E., sometime Hon. Secretary of the V. R. Society, Rajshahi, who briefly stated the subject matter of the paper in a paper by him, entitled 'Finger-posts of Bengal History,' published in the *IHQ*., vol. VII, p. 454. The paper is now published with a small addition at the end, as having a direct bearing on the remarkable discovery of archaeological relics at the Maināmati Hills in the Tippera district, which is bound to raise many a new problem for the historians to solve.

kingdom. It appears that Wu-hing came to Harikela, which was 'the eastern limit of Eastern India,' starting by sea from Siṃhala towards the north-east. He remained there one year and thence went to Nālandā which is said to be about 100 *yojanas* from Harikela (Takakusu: p. xlvi, Dr. R. C. Majumdar in the *Pravāsī* for Āśvina 1331 B.S. p. 795). The extent of I-tsing's *yojana* is uncertain, but an idea of the distance between Nālandā and Harikela can be gathered from the fact that Tāmralipta, according to I-tsing, is more than 60 *yojanas* south (?south-east) from Nālandā on the one hand (Takakusu: p. xxxi, Watter's *Yuan Chwang*, vol. II, p. 190) and 40 *yojanas* south (? south-west) from the eastern limit of India on the other (Takakusu: p. xxxiii). Modern Tamluk is roughly 250 miles from Gaya and Harikela then would be about 400 miles from Gaya, taking us roughly to the eastern borders of the districts of Tippera and Noakhali in Eastern Bengal. Harikela's proximity to the sea indicated by Wu-hing's account precludes the possibility of its lying further up in the north. It should be considered in this connection that I-tsing does not apparently identify Harikela with Samataṭa which is also mentioned by him in the same work in his account of the Chinese traveller Seng Chi. I-tsing merely places Samataṭa in *East India* (Watters, vol. II, p. 188), implying that Harikela which is the eastern limit of Eastern India is further east from Samataṭa.

The other literary references to Harikela are scanty and practically useless for the purposes of identification. In the *Karpūramañjarī* of Rājaśekhara (900 A.D.) occurs the following passage in Act I:—जय पूर्वदिगङ्गना-भुजङ्ग चम्पा-चम्पककर्णपूर लीलानिर्जितराढादेश विक्रमाक्रान्तकामरूप हरिकेली-केलिकारक अवमानित-कर्णसुवर्णदान (Nirn. Ed. p. 13). This simply eliminates the countries Rāḍha, Kāmarūpa and Karṇasuvarṇa for the identification of Harikela. Foucher in his *Iconographie* (vol. I, p. 200) reproduced the text of a label:—हरिकेलदेशे शिललोकनाथः from a Ms. dated 1015 A.D. The same Ms. gives another label as चन्द्रद्वीपे भगवतीतारा. So, Candradvīpa is more likely than not different from Harikela. In the *Ḍākārṇava* occur the following verses referring to Harikela:

राढी ढिंक्करी वङ्गाली खाडी च हरिकेलकी। चरितं हरिकेलश्च मायापुरी श्मशानकम्।

(*Cat. of Buddhist Mss.*, *A.S.B.*, pp. 92, 96)

If the process of elimination be allowed to operate here also, Harikela becomes different from the well-known country of Vaṅgāla i.e. East Bengal roughly. Yādavaprakāśa and Hemacandra identify Harikela with Vaṅg[illegible]. This is too vague an identification to be of any practical use.

Harikela is mentioned in two important epigraphic records of Bengal. In the Rāmpāl plate of Śrīcandra (as well as in the Dhulla plate of the same king:—*Ins. of Bengal,* vol. III, p. 165) occurs the following verse (No. 5):—

पुत्रस्तस्य पवित्रितोभयकुलः कौलीनभीताशयै
स्त्रैलोक्ये विदितो दिशामतिथिभिस्त्रैलोक्यचन्द्रो गुणैः ।
आधारो **हरिकेल**-राजककुदच्छत्रस्मितानां श्रियां
यश्चन्द्रोपपदे बभूव नृपतिर्द्वीपे दिलीपोपमः ॥

The late Mr. Majumdar took the verse to mean that king Trailokyacandra's kingdom was Harikela, 'including Candradvīpa which was the home territory of the dynasty.' (*ib.*, p. 3). His translation of the last half of the verse is as follows:—'He who was like Dilīpa became king in the 'Dvīpa' (island) to which is joined (the word) 'Candra' and was the support of Fortune goddesses (of other kings) smiling at (i.e. joyful on account of) the umbrella which was the royal insignia of the king of Harikela.' (*ib.*, p. 7). This interpretation seems to be wrong; for, the king Trailokyacandra is described by a well-known poetic conceit as becoming the lord of the Fortunes not certainly of other (vassal) kings but of a famous king of Harikela, whose dominions passed to Trailokya or his immediate ancestors not apparently by lineal succession. In other words the first line simply means that Trailokya became the king of Harikela; the next line can, therefore, only mean that subsequently he became the king of another kingdom Candradvīpa. The comparison with Dilīpa may signify that he was the first of a new line of kings at Candradvīpa just as Dilīpa was in the *Raghuvaṃśam* of Kālidāsa. Anyhow the verse is a narration of the territorial dominions of king Trailokyacandra and it is very unlikely that a single territory should be mentioned here in two different names and in two different phrases in the same sentence. Candradvīpa has been included in Harikela by some scholars apparently relying on vague identification of Hemacandra; but as we have seen above this goes against the more definite evidence of I-tsing.

The next reference to Harikela is in the unfinished inscription of Kāntideva, recovered from an old temple in Chittagong and now deposited in the Dacca Museum. Since the publication of the text of the inscription by us (*Modern Review,* Nov., 1922) we made thorough local enquiries into the history of the copper-plate and the full story of its discovery is given below. About the year 1915 the curious heavy thing apparently of stone was accidentally found and brought out from beneath the pedestal of God Rādhāmādhava in the main shrine of the old temple of Chittagong. It was awfully

corroded and was first taken to the then Superintendent of the Chittagong Madrasa, who rightly found out that the inscription was not Persian or Arabic. It was then taken to the Head Clerk of the Bengal Bank, who is reported to have deciphered 5 letters (apparently the emblem on the seal) as 'Kākavāyasa'!! The late Mr. Satish Chandra Ghosh, the historian of Chittagong, took a pencil rubbing of the plate, which however was too imperfect for decipherment. The history of the temple where the plate was discovered goes back to the Moghul period. One Adhīnadāsa Vairāgī an upcountry ascetic founded the image of Rādhāmādhava and received *Devottara* lands from Reja Khan, the then Governor of Chittagong by a *sanad* dated 23 Safar of the first regnal year of Emperor Shah Jahan III (1759-60 A.D.). Another large property was granted by Newajis Md. Khan. In the year 1126 *Maghi* (1764 A.D.) the huge properties stood in the name of Jagannāthadāsa Gossain (a disciple of Adhīnadāsa), the most famous *Mohunta* of the temple which went by his name for a long time. A long succession of Mohuntas lineally descended from Jagannātha ended with the death of Bālakadāsa in 1894 and the Managing Committee appointed a new Mohunta (who had no connection with the former Mohuntas) named Haragovindadāsa, whose disciple Rāmadāsa (1896-1926 A.D.) allowed us to examine the plate.

Rāmadāsa informed us that they have got a large property also in the Tippera district. An examination of the records preserved in the Tippera Collectorate elicited the fact that Mahārājā Kṛṣṇamāṇikya (1760-83 A.D.) of Tippera made a large gift of lands in and around the village named Jagannātha Uttar, only about two miles from the town of Comilla, to the above mentioned Jagannātha Gossain, for the worship of a deity named Narasiṃha (Cakra) established by that king in that village. The date of this grant is 5th Vaiśākha 1184 Tippera Era (April, 1774 A.D.). Jagannātha and the succeeding Mohuntas remained at Chittagong and arranged for the worship of the god Narasiṃha by appointing a local man there, who acted both as a priest and a clerk (*Gomastā*). In the year 1840 during the times of Mohunta Rādhikādāsa the *Devottara* lands of the god Narasiṃha were resumed by the reigning king of Tippera; but they were subsequently settled with Rādhikādāsa as a *Tāluka* with a fixed revenue. Rādhikādāsa soon after erected a brick-built temple for the god in the fifties of the last century. The village Jagannātha Uttar is now popularly known as *Itāllā* and the temple is still found there on a plot of slightly raised ground covering an

area' of more than 8 *Bighās*. This happens to be an ancient site with heaps of brickbats lying scattered over a wide area and is mentioned in old documents as the Mūḍā (hillock) of king Bhavacandra; a large tank on the south of the temple is also known as the Tank of king Bhavacandra ('Bhavacandra Rājār Dīghī'). According to a well-known tradition current in the locality king Bhavacandra and his whole family perished as the result of a tragedy in a pit full of flames and a large hollow in front of the temple, now being gradually filled up in course of time, is said to mark the place of that grim tragedy. The temple itself was finally deserted by the late Mohunta Rāmadāsa, who, owing to troubles with the people of the locality, removed the god Narasiṃha with other images and things to the temple at Chittagong. These things did not include the copper-plate under question as Rāmadāsa himself told us. But the respectable people of the locality near Itāllā testifies to the fact that in the temple at Itāllā there was deposited a copperplate inscribed in the Sanskrit language supposed to contain an account of king Bhavacandra. This plate was removed to Chittagong by Bālakadāsa Mohunta, son of Rādhikādāsa, who died in 1894. The plate while at Itāllā was sought to be deciphered with the help of a Paṇḍit by Mahārājā Īśānacandra-māṇikya (1849-63 A.D.) of Tippera.[2] There is however no tradition regarding the find-place of the plate; but it can be reasonably supposed that it was probably discovered within this very *Mūḍā* during the erection of the temple by Rādhikādāsa. The close proximity of the district town of Comilla precludes the possibility of an antiquarian object like a copperplate coming to a small village mostly peopled by illiterate cultivators from any great distance. The fact that the possession of the plate remained with the above Mohuntas till the last and that a king of Tippera sent a Paṇḍit down to the village to decipher it without attempting to acquire it points to the same conclusion.

The Harikelā-maṇḍala or the kingdom of Harikela may under the above circumstances be identified with a tract roughly covering the southern part of the district of Tippera on the evidence of the find-spot of the plate. The ruins at Itāllā extend up to a distance of about three miles to the north, in which there are three or four other small mounds (Muḍās). Itāllā is only a couple of miles to the north-east of the town of Comilla. About five miles

2 This important piece of news was gathered from Mr. Gagan Chandra Chakravarti of Pāchthupi (adjacent to Itāllā), who heard it from his father late Madan Mohan Chakravarti.

to the west of the town is the famous range of small hills known as the Lalmai and Maināmati Hills, extending towards the south to a distance of about ten miles. The northernmost range Maināmati is a separate one and is a popular resort of towns-people. It contains in one hillock remarkable ruins evidently of an ancient palace and a temple. The Lalmai range begins only a small distance to the south and for a distance of about five miles to the south upto a hillock known as 'Koṭbāḍi' each and every one of its large number of peaks (Muḍās) is covered with a most remarkable set of ruins without its parallel, perhaps, anywhere in East Bengal. A large number of images was discovered in different parts of the range and the ruins of a fort were discovered in one of the hillocks along with a copper-plate of Raṇavaṅkamalla Harikaladeva of Pattikera dated 1141 Śaka (1220 A.D.). Some of the peaks are still associated with the names of ancient kings like Māṇikcānd, his son Gopicānd, Vijaya Rājā, Bhoja Rājā, Ānanda Rājā, Salban Rājā etc. Several large tanks at the foot of the hills on either side are also associated with ancient names. Though most of the ruins cannot be dated before the 10th century A.D., it is likely that far more ancient ruins are lying deeper below the surfaces. We are tempted by the nature and surroundings of this ancient site to hazard a conjecture that the ancient university of Harikela must be lying buried in this very range of hills.

II

Since the above was written a more definite statement for the identification of Harikela was found in the following line of *Kalpadru-koṣa* (G.O.S., vol. I, p. 7): —

श्रीहट्टो हरिकेलिः स्याच्छ्रीहटोपि क्वचिद्भवेत् ।

Strangely enough this very line with the reading Harikela for Harikeli has been traced in a lexicon named *Rūpacintāmaṇi* composed in 10 years and completed in 1515 Śaka (1593 A.D.) by one Yādavānanda Dāsa of Śrīhaṭṭa (Sylhet) (Ms. No. 1451 of the Dacca University, fol. 15a). There is no doubt that these two late writers must have come across some unknown but reliable authority to make such a clear statement. A corroboration of this statement has fortunately been traced by us in an earlier work. A fragment of a *Smṛti* work named *Kṛtyasāra* by Vāsudeva Kavikaṅkana-cakravartī (fol. 32 only) is in our possession. The author is a comparatively early writer and flourished, we believe, not later than the 15th century A.D. For, the latest work he cites is the *Ratnākara* (fol. 6a) and he quotes twice

from an early work *Smṛtimañjūṣā* (fol. 8a & 23a), which no scholar of Bengal and Mithilā after Śrīdattopādhyāya and Harinātha (*vide J.A.S.B.*, 1915, pp. 379-80, 387) has ever cited. His antiquity is also indicated by the manner of his reference to Aniruddha Bhaṭṭa, अनिरुद्धभट्टव्यवस्थया गौडीयाचार्य्यैः सन्ध्या कार्य्या। (fol. 16b). In this book in a section called रुद्राक्षमाहात्म्य the following verses are cited as from the *Liṅgapurāṇa*:—(fol. 28b)

त्रिपुरस्य वधे काले रुद्रस्याक्ष्णोऽपतंस्तु ये। अश्रवो विन्दवस्ते तु रुद्राक्षा अभवन् भुवि॥
रुद्रवामाक्षिसंभूतं रुद्राक्षं कामरूपके। दक्षिणाक्षाश्रुसम्भूतं हरिकोलोद्भवं विदुः॥

The author adds the note 'हरिकोलः श्रीहट्टदेशः'. This identification is slightly in conflict with the evidence we have discussed above. We shall venture to suggest, however, for the consideration of scholars that a genuine tradition placing Harikela within the present Tippera district was recorded in the original sources of the above Harikela-Srīhaṭṭa texts, but the tradition was completely lost in course of time and the later authors adopted an easy but wrong reading and identification.

Hiuen Tsang, as is well known, did not visit the countries to the east of Samataṭa but recorded the names of six kingdoms as he could gather at Samataṭa. The identification of these kingdoms has been a matter of great controversy among scholars. We are concerned here with the first named kingdom called 'Shih-li-ch'a-to-lo' which was situated to the north-east of Samataṭa according to 'the reading of all the texts, of the Life and of the Fang-chih' (Watters' *Yuan Chwang*, vol. II, p. 189), and not to the south-east as read by some. Watters and V. Smith surmised that it was situated somewhere in the Tippera district. The late Mm. Padmanātha Bhaṭṭācārya (*J.R.A.S.*, 1920, p. 1 f.) stated that it was identical with Śrīhaṭṭa or modern Sylhet. It has, however, escaped the notice of all scholars that within the Tippera district itself a name corresponding to the Chinese 'Shih-li-ch'a-to-lo' is traceable in that of a small *Pargana* comprised of a number of villages very near the well-known village of Baḍ-kāntā. The name of this very small *pargana* is 'Sircāil' (शिरचाइल), sometimes written in a Sanskritised form as Śricāla. (*Rājmālā* by K. C. Simha, pp. 426, 441). In the rent-roll of Todar Malla the revenue is found as only 13,000 *Dams*. In W. Wroughton's *Report* dated the 12th of February 1788 the name is given as 'Serechaul' with a revenue of 2,200/-. It is described as a small *mahal* surrounded by Buldacaul, Dorely and Mehar, formed from jungle lands and with very poor and indigent proprietors. But the most important fact that has recently been found by us in old documents is that this Sircāil was the original name

of Baldakhal or Bardakhat, one of the biggest parganas in the district of Tippera. We give below a short account of this important discovery. A large rent-free grant of the nature of *Madadmās* was made to one Saiyad Mahammad Ali, son of Saiyad Abul Faiz Razvi in the reign of Emperor Aurangzeb; the lands measured 200 *Bighās* within two villages (Korbanpur and Chapair) of the Pargana Bardakhat. A resumption case was instituted by Government in 1840 at Comilla when the proprietors submitted a large number of valuable documents, copies of which are preserved in the Tippera Collectorate (Register B. 1, No. 81). It appears that Mirja Md. Ibrahim, a former Zamindar of Bardakhat, partly dispossessed Saiyad Md. Askari, the daughter's son of the original grantee, when the latter went to Murshidabad with a large number of papers, including a Farman, Parwanas of Asad Khan, Azub Khan and Amir-ul-Umrah (i.e. Saistah Khan) and a Sanad of Mir Md. Sadeq Asadjang. The older papers are no longer available except a copy of the last mentioned Sanad of Sadeq, whose date, however, is lost. The name of the Pargana is clearly written in this Sanad as *'Sirical oraf Baldākhāl.'* At Murshidabad Newajis Md. Khan (Shahmat Jung) granted a fresh Sanad to Md. Askari, dated 2 Rabi II, 1168 *Hijri* (January, 1755 A.D.). Here also the same phrase is found. There is no doubt that this description of the Pargana was borrowed from the older Sanads of the reign of Aurangzeb. So, Śircāil at one time formed a major portion of the district of Tippera and preserves the name of a very ancient kingdom which might have extended to the hills on the east and to the sea on the south. It subsequently merged into neighbouring kingdoms including Samataṭa till the name was almost completely lost. It is our conjecture that the early writers recorded the identity of Harikela with this Śircāil, whose ancient form was Śrīcaṭṭa, Śrīcaṭa or Śrīcattara (from Śrīcatvara) and we believe it better corresponds phonetically and topographically with the Shih-li-ch'a-to-lo' of Hiuen Tsang. In this connection we should refer to the following verse of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (G. Sastri, p. 648):—

सिध्यते च तदा तारा यक्षराट् चैव महाबलः ।
हरिकेल-कर्म्मरङ्गे च कामरूपे कलशाह्वये ॥ v. 900

Karmaraṅga seems to us to be the 'Kia-mia-lang-ka' of Hiuen Tsang which is to the south-east of Shih-li-ch'a-to-lo. If so, its mention along with Harikela and Kāmarūpa here makes it impossible to place it in Burma. In the Map given by Julien it is shown as an island to the immediate east of Samataṭa.

DINESH CHANDRA BHATTACHARYYA

British Policy towards the Afghan War of Succession (1863-1868)

I.* *Revolt of Amin Khan (June, 1863—May, 1864).*

Amir Dost Muhammad Khan died on June 9, 1863. Before his death he had nominated his son, Sher Ali Khan, who had acted as his 'prime agent and minister' for some years,[1] as his successor. Sher Ali was neither the eldest nor the ablest among his sons. The old Amir's selection was not accepted in good spirit by some of the influential Sirdars of Afghanistan, but as long as he was alive his influence was strong enough to keep them silent. Sher Ali was fully conscious of the weakness of his position. For a few days he suppressed the news of Dost Muhammad's death and took measures to strengthen himself. The number of guards at the gates of Herat[2] was increased. All Government property was removed to the fort. An attempt was made to imprison all hostile Sirdars, but the wise and tactful chief, Sirdar Muhammad Usman Khan, persuaded Sher Ali to adopt a conciliatory policy. The hostile Sirdars were summoned to the new Amir's presence and induced to 'form a contract of friendly relations for the future.'[3] But the new Amir's position was so precarious that Ghulam Husain Khan, the then British Agent in Afghánistan, wrote in his report, "It will be well if all the Kabul Sirdars submit and ally themselves with Amir Sher Ali Khan without seeking other alliances. In the event of any of them offering

1 Imperial Record Department, Foreign Department Proceedings, Political A Branch, January, 1864, No. 280.

2 At the time of Dost Muhammad's death Sher Ali was engaged in conquering the Herat province.

3 That this reconciliation was half-hearted, so far as the brothers of the new Amir are concerned, is clear from the British Agent's report:

"Just at present Sirdar Muhammad Azim Khan, *from motives of policy*, is loud in his protestations of allegiance to the new Amir ..." *P. P.(A)*, September, 1863, No. 93. Only Sirdar Muhammad Afzal Khan seems to have been really loyal. He advised Sirdar Muhammad Azim Khan to "seek in every way to give satisfaction to Amir Sher Ali Khan, considering such conduct to be the best way of pleasing him (Afzal) and in order that the misfortunes of dissension may be avoided". He also informed the new Amir that, although he was the senior in age, yet he obediently accepted his father's decision. *P. P.(A)*, September, 1863, No. 95. He also read the *Khutbah* in Sher Ali's name. *P. P.(A)*, September, 1863, No. 146.

to separate themselves and make overtures to the British Government, what am I to do? Am I to listen to and forward the representations of all, or only the letters of Amir Sher Ali Khan?"[4]

This was the primary question that the Government of India had to deal with during the years 1863-1868. Lord Elgin had no time to frame a consistent policy, for he died in November, 1863. He was succeeded in January, 1864, by Lord Lawrence, whom many Anglo-Indian administrators regarded as a great frontier expert. The new Viceroy found himself in a difficult situation as soon as he assumed office, but Sher Ali's profession of friendship gave him a breathing space. Sher Ali was fully aware of the value of the British friendship which his father had tried to foster during the last years of his life. Within a few days of the old Amir's death he wrote to the Commissioner of Peshawar (on June 12, 1863), "......I will retain my father's excellent custom of preserving friendship and alliance with the British Government and strengthen it during my life."[5]

The first rebel against the new Amir was his brother Sirdar Muhammad Amin Khan. Before the capture of Herat Sher Ali had promised him the government of that province if it fell into his hands. "When Herat was taken and the promise was not fulfilled, Sirdar Muhammad Amin Khan was very angry and left the place with his force without having obtained Sher Ali Khan's consent and at a time when the Amir[6] was desperately ill." On the intelligence of the Amir's death reaching him, he immediately seized the Government horses and mules at Kandahar, prevented the working of the gold mines by Sher Ali's men and took possession of the gold previously collected by them, and 'confiscated all the property both in cash and other ways held' by Sher Ali's servants in the Kandahar province.[7] When this rebel Sirdar arrived at the city of Kandahar, the British Agent "went out to meet him, partly to offer the customary condolence on the Amir's death, and partly to perform the prescribed office of welcome and respect to the Sirdar himself."[8] Although there was as yet no open breach between the Amir and his brother, the British Agent reported early in July, "Sirdar Muhammad Amin Khan's arrangements for the careful protection of the city of Kandahar by entertaining men for the occupation of the gates and

4 *P. P.(A)*, December, 1861, No. 134; July, 1863, No. 141; September, 1863, No. 92.

5 *P. P.(A)*, September, 1863, No. 92.

6 Dost Muhammad.

7 *P. P.(A)*, September, 1863, No. 93.

8 *Ibid.*, No. 94.

bastions are decidedly on the increase."[9] The Sirdar asked the Agent "if the advantage enjoyed by the French, Russian and Turkish Governments of purchasing arms in England was extended to other States also, from which it appeared that the Sirdar entertained the desire of purchasing English arms." The Agent replied that "in India none but servants of the Government were allowed to purchase arms."[10] Probably the Sirdar had secret accomplices and sympathisers, for the British Agent reported, "The Sirdars and Chiefs of Kabul and Kandahar consult much among themselves, and are in the position of men awaiting their opportunity."[11]

Sher Ali Khan left Herat on July 5 and arrived at Kandahar on August 3. In the meantime he had offended another brother, Sirdar Muhammad Azim Khan, who wanted to lead an expedition against some rebellious tribes on the borders of Turkistan and Kabul. This plan was originally suggested by Sirdar Muhammad Afzal Khan, the Amir's eldest brother, but the Amir rejected it. Azim Khan interpreted the Amir's refusal as loss of confidence and fled towards the Hazara province. The Amir at once placed two of his well-wishers in confinement and asked Amin Khan to 'capture the fugitive Sirdar.'[12] Obviously Sher Ali thought it prudent to conciliate Amin Khan at this juncture. Sirdar Fateh Muhammad Khan, son of the Vizier Muhammad Akbar Khan, had a long private interview with Amin Khan, and it was decided that Amin Khan should proceed to Kabul in order to counteract the machinations of Azim Khan.[13]

The situation was serious indeed. Amin Khan told the British Agent that "every single man of note and importance in the country is consutling, plotting and establishing relations for himself with those far and near."[14] Messengers were constantly coming and going but, as the British Agent reported, "nothing transpires concerning the intelligence they bring."[15] On August 5 Sher Ali "had a private interview with the Kandahar Sirdars, and addressed them saying that, although the late Amir had conquered that country, yet on account of their high rank and consideration he had not taken the Government from them, and now he wished to know what were their feelings and intentions. The Sirdars replied that they were the servants of the Government and would perform whatever duties they were

9 *P. P.(A)*, September, 1863, No. 95.
10 *Ibid.*, No. 96.
11 *Ibid.*, No. 97.
12 *Ibid.*, No. 98.
13 *Ibid.*, No. 99.
14 *Ibid.*, No. 100.
15 *Ibid.*, No. 144.

sent upon......The Amir was satisfied with their profession."[16] The Amir then asked Amin Khan whether he was prepared to accompany him to Kabul. Amin Khan signified his readiness to obey the Amir's command, for, he said, "he was desirous to be appointed Vizier of the country with full powers in all matters concerning the army and other departments." To this demand Sher Ali gave no reply.[17] It was arranged that Amin Khan should stay a week or ten days behind the Amir at Kandahar 'on the pretext of arranging his affairs before departure.'[18]

Before the Amir's departure from Kandahar it was reported that Afzal Khan, who had so long spoken and acted loyally, was collecting troops in Turkistan.[19] Sirdar Muhammad Ali Khan, the Amir's eldest son, detached parties of men to occupy all the roads and passes from Turkistan towards Kabul. "The Amir, after carefully considering the matter, wrote to Sirdar Muhammad Ali Khan disapproving of this arrangement on two accounts, one being that, supposing Sirdar Muhammad Afzal Khan to be not already disaffected, this display of suspicion and distrust must necessarily drive him into opposition; the second objection was, that the parties being small, they would not be able for a moment to oppose the advance of the Sirdar's troops, and the consequence would be that they would come flying into Kabul, which should have an evil and dis-spiriting effect on others, and be disgraceful to them as Government troops."[20]

On August 10 the Amir received from Muhammad Ali Khan a letter which informed him that Azim Khan was trying to raise a rebellion in Logur, a district under his own charge. The people of Logur refused to join the movement, and Muhammad Ali Khan encircled Azim Khan with the assistance of the Ghilzai chiefs, in whose loyalty he placed the fullest confidence. One aspect of Sher Ali's character is revealed in an interesting sentence in the British Agent's diary: "The Amir, having received this intelligence so full of trouble and mischief, remained silent, awaiting the decision of Providence in the matter."[21] Muhammad Ali Khan repeatedly

16 *P. P.(A)*, September, 1863, No. 145. 17 *Ibid.*, No. 145.

18 *Ibid.*, No. 146. 19 *Ibid.*, No. 145. 20 *Ibid.*, No. 146.

21 *Ibid.*, No. 146. In April, 1864, the Commissioner of Peshawar described the Amir, in one of his official letters, as 'notoriously apathetic and little given to the transaction of public affairs'. Even Sirdar Muhammad Rafik Khan, one of the Amir's best friends, 'lamented his lethergy and want of tact'.—*P. P.(A)*, May, 1864, No. 77.

invited the Amir's attention to the seriousness of the situation. He wrote, "When the arrow has left the bow, it does not again come to the hand."[22] The helpless Amir reported the matter to Amin Khan and other Sirdars, but they showed no desire to give him prompt assistance.[23] Fortune came to the Amir's rescue at this crisis. Unable to persuade the people of Logur to join him, Azim Khan fled to Zoormut and took shelter in the fort of Gurdez (due east of Ghazni).[24]

Towards the middle of August the Amir left Kandahar and proceeded towards Kabul. *En route* he received a friendly letter from Afzal Khan, who loudly condemned Azim Khan's treachery and insisted on his own loyalty. Now the Amir's "whole manner was changed from anxiety to satisfaction."[25] But this expression of satisfaction was premature. Azim Khan was collecting troops and establishing secret contact with influential persons in Kabul as well as in the Amir's camp. He was anxiously awaiting Afzal Khan's approach from Turkistan. Afzal Khan, actuated by his former dislike of Sher Ali and inflamed by the severities exercised by Muhammad Ali Khan on the families of officers serving under him in Turkistan, made over the charge of Turkistan to local chiefs (Mirs) and proceeded with his army towards Kabul. If he succeeded in securing the throne, the Mirs of Turkistan would remain his loyal vassals. If he failed to capture Kabul, he might take shelter in Turkistan and, with the assistance of the grateful Mirs, convert it into a base of operations against Sher Ali.[26]

The Amir arrived at Ghazni on August 24 and waited for Azim Khan's reply to a conciliatory letter despatched to him a few days ago.[27] On August 28 he received a message from Azim Khan to the effect that "he was merely occupying the territory assigned to him by the late Amir and had no wish to meddle with his (Sher Ali's) territory; he, therefore, begged that the Amir would regard the arrangement made by their mutual parent and continue his march to Kabul; otherwise, in utter dislike to him (Sher Ali), he should trust the matter to God."[28]

Such an explicit message could not be allowed to go unchallenged. The Amir wanted to march at once upon the fort of Gurdez, but some of the principal Sirdars induced him to protract the negotiations.[29] These critical

22 *P. P.(A)*, September, 1863, No. 181.
23 *Ibid.*, No. 146.
24 *P. P.(A)*, October, 1863, No. 32.
25 *Ibid.*
26 *P. P.(A)*, November, 1863, No. 59.
27 *Ibid.*, Nos. 59, 60.
28 *Ibid.*, No. 62.
29 *Ibid.*, Nos. 62, 63.

days Azim Khan utilised in collecting provisions and conciliating the warlike population of Zoormut. In the meantime a friendly message from the Sultan of Bukhara[30] strengthened Afzal Khan's resolution to begin an open contest for the throne. He gave up the plan of surrendering Turkistan to the Mirs, placed it under the charge of faithful partisans, and 'employed himself in preparing an efficient force to enable him to march on Kabul.' An open conflict seemed so imminent that the British Agent (who was accompanying the Amir) was instructed to 'sit aside and watch the progress of events' as soon as war broke out.[31]

Early in September, nine principal Sirdars visited Azim Khan in his camp and induced him to meet the Amir at a personal interview. The Amir "went out a mile on road to meet Muhammad Azim Khan, and, having embraced him, they mounted on elephants and came into camp. Sirdar Muhammad Azim Khan was lodged in a separate tent, openly with the object of giving him confidence, but secretly to keep a watch on the intercourse he might hold with the people of the camp."[32] An agreement was concluded between the two brothers on September 3. Azim Khan promised to "consider my brother as entirely in the place and position of my late father, on condition of receiving from my brother the same amount of pay, money, grants, territorial charge, honour and consideration that I received from my father." Sher Ali promised to "carry on exactly the same course of conduct with regard to him which my father observed."[33] After the conclusion of this agreement the Amir advanced towards Kabul and entered the city on September 9. The British Agent took up his old quarters in the capital.[34]

It was now necessary to deal with Amin Khan and Afzal Khan. Probably Azim Khan's surrender to the Amir had a depressing effect on the latter, for after the Amir's arrival at Kabul, Afzal Khan refused to send assistance to one of his partisans (Sirdar Muhammad Uslum Khan). With Amin Khan's conduct the Amir was 'extremely dissatisfied,' and his intention was to 'take him severely to task' after 'securing himself entirely from injury from the side of Turkistan.'[35] One of the Amir's partisans occupied

30 The Sultan sent no letter of condolence to Sher Ali after the old Amir's death. *P. P.(A)*, January, 1864, No. 284.

31 *P. P.(A)*, November, 1863, No. 62.

32 *P. P.(A)*, November, 1863, No. 63.

33 *P. P.(A)*, January, 1864, No. 280

34 *Ibid.*, No. 281.

35 *Ibid.*

Bamian by means of a stratagem. It was reported that Abdur Rahman Khan, Afzal Khan's son, was successfully quelling disturbaces in Turkistan[36] and strengthening his father's cause.[37] Why Afzal Khan pursued so half-hearted and halting a policy it is difficult to ascertain precisely. The British Agent reported, "Even Sirdar Muhammad Afzal Khan,......whether from fear of losing his hold upon Turkistan, from want of vigour, from sense of prudence, or want of confidence in his own troops, most of which belong to Kabul, abstained from making any attempt......"[38]

Towards the close of September the British Agent at Kabul reported, "The Amir's prospects are at present good." He added, "None have yet succeeded in greatly molesting him, but most of those who were secretly opposed to him, being now ashamed of themselves, make a show of submission."[39] Sher Ali naturally wanted to strengthen his own position by securing from the British Government a formal recognition of his succession. He became very anxious when it was reported to him that a confidential agent of Azim Khan had gone to Peshawar and begun negotiations with the Commissioner. Azim Khan had, indeed, sent two letters to the Commissioner, asking for British assistance and claiming that he was trying 'to establish his own authority' in co-operation with Afzal Khan. The Commissioner replied to these letters after the conclusion of the agreement between Sher Ali and Azim Khan. At that stage, he remarked, no 'further allusion to the original communication' was necessary. In order to satisfy Sher Ali the Commissioner suggested to the Punjab Government that the new Amir should be 'at once acknowledged as his father's successor.'[40] This suggestion was approved by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab.[41] No prompt notice being taken of this suggestion by the Government of India, the Commissioner remarked on November 14, 1863, "What appears to be the evil of our not acknowledging the *de facto* ruler of the country is that the other Sirdars, to whom the fact of our keeping the matter in suspense is well known, will be inclined to think that we have other intentions, that we have, in fact, selected some successor other than

36 Afzal Khan wrote to Azim Khan that "he has no longer the power which he had under the late Amir, that formerly he found no difficulty in keeping the country tranquil, but that it is quite impossible that this state affairs can continue". *P. P.(A)*, January, 1864, No. 292.

37 *Ibid.*, No. 282.
38 *Ibid.*, No. 284.
39 *Ibid.*
40 *Ibid.*
41 *Ibid.*, No. 283.

the present one whom we mean to favour, and such a belief can only foster distrust and dissension, while it will greatly weaken the present Amir's hands."[42]

In the meantime Afzal Khan and Azim Khan were pushing on their intrigues and preparations. It was necessary for the former to march upon Kabul before the snow fell. The British Agent reported that "without some such demonstration", it would be difficult for him to retain his hold upon Turkistan.[43] But Afzal Khan continued to pacify the Amir with good-will missions and friendly letters. Azim Khan wrote another letter to the Commissioner of Peshawar, stating that Sher Ali was violating the terms of the agreement, and re-iterating his plan to rise against him in co-operation with Afzal Khan. Sher Ali was not ignorant of these secrets. He was "using every means to thwart Afzal Khan's military arrangements and thus to undermine his power of doing mischief when the time comes". He wanted to procure 6,000 muskets from British territory with the assistance of the Commissioner of Peshawar, obviously for the purpose of using them in the impending contest with Afzal Khan.[44] The British Agent reported, "The Amir's policy is so to weaken the influence and means of those Sirdars who are not in his confidence, that the objects of all in regard to himself may be frustrated, and that they may become utterly dependent upon himself for a provision".[45]

On December 8 Sir William Denison, Officiating Viceroy, wrote a formal letter to the Amir. It was full of friendly sentiments, but there was no direct recognition of Sher Ali's claim to the throne.[46] This letter was not likely to re-assure the Amir's suspicious mind. As early as October 28 he had told the British Agent that "the British made treaties which suited their own views merely and were of no advantage to the Kabul State". He added that "the existing relations between the two Governments were not assuring; they served to pass the time merely". The British Agent shrewdly observed, "he seems inclined to hold his head high".[47]

42 *P. P.(A)*, January, 1864, No. 286. 43 *Ibid.*, No. 285.

44 *Ibid.*, No. 291. The Governor-General refused to comply with the Amir's request "until the Supreme Government learns more of the real intentions of the Amir and has more experience of the stability of his position". *P. P.(A)*, January, 1864, No. 293.

45 *Ibid.*, No. 286. 46 *Ibid.*, No. 287.

47 *Ibid.*, No. 291.

The impending contest was coming nearer day by day. Azim Khan began to punish those chiefs of Zoormut who had submitted to the Amir and received favours from him. The Amir warned him, but in vain. Amin Khan strengthened the fortifications of Kandahar. The Amir resolved to effect a reduction of the cavalry and to increase his infantry.[48]

Early in December Azim Khan raised the curtain and openly entered the arena of contest. He asked the Amir to give up Kabul and to retire to Herat. He also requested some 'chiefs of the hill country' to be prepared and to expect Afzal Khan who would come after the *Naoroz* with an army against Kabul. Sher Ali informed Azim Khan 'that the treaty of peace between them was at an end'. Afzal Khan was asked to summon Azim Khan to Turkistan.[49] The Amir's difficulty was accentuated by the fact that the Kandahar Sirdars were prepared to join any movement led by Afzal Khan and Azim Khan. Even Amin Khan was ready to employ his forces against the Amir.[50]

On January 15, 1864, the Commissioner of Peshawar reported to the Punjab Government, "The preparations made by Sirdar Muhammad Afzal Khan to enable him to leave Turkistan and advance on Kabul after the *Naoroz* are no longer matters of conjecture".[51] He was encouraged by the resolution of the Kandahar Sirdars and relieved from 'all anxiety from the Bukhara side by his friendly alliance with the Sultan'.[52]

On February 12, one Nazir Haidar Khan, an agent of Afzal Khan, arrived at Kabul, 'ostensibly to make certain representations to the Amir, but really to ascertain the feeling of the other Sirdars'. Nazir Haidar Khan told the Amir that Afzal Khan 'had no desire to turn from his allegiance' and 'wished to come to Kabul unattended, that he might by a personal interview remove all cause of anger'. The Amir shrewdly replied that "if the Sirdar's object in coming to Kabul was to raise a faction in his own favour, it would not answer, because he could not allow him to hold free intercourse with any one he pleased". The Amir was convinced that Afzal Khan sent

48 "The Amir has been somewhat perplexed as to the state of his cavalry forces, and he contemplates a reform of this branch of his army. Whether from deficient organization or want of zeal in the service, the cavalry have not recently come up to the proper fighting standard. This was clearly exemplified in the actions before Herat". *P. P.(A)*, January, 1864, No. 291.

49 *Ibid.*, No. 298.

50 *Ibid.*, No. 301.

51 *Ibid.*, February, 1864, No. 203.

52 *Ibid.*, March, 1864, No. 101.

letters to Peshawar, but this, we know, was not true. It was finally decided that the Amir should send 'an accredited agent' to Afzal Khan. But this decision was reversed as soon as Nazir Haidar Khan demanded the release of some of Afzal Khan's friends. The Amir's soldiers were recalled from leave.[53]

On February 28 Ghulam Husain Khan, British Agent in Afghanistan, left Kabul with the Amir's full approval, and arrived at Peshawar a few days later. During his absence the current duties of his office were conducted by his *munshi,* Muhammad Bakhtyar, who is described in official documents as 'intelligent and trustworthy'.[54] One of his earliest reports relates to the interception of Nazir Haidar Khan's final letter to Afzal Khan. In that letter Nazir Haidar Khan wrote "that the Amir's anger and resentment had tied such a knot in the Sirdar's (Afzal Khan's) affairs as could only be cut by the sword, and that, having sounded the officers of the Government, he found some requiring money, others guarantee, and some voluntarily well disposed towards the Sirdar".[55] This letter fell into the Amir's hands and naturally deepened his suspicions.

Ghulam Husain Khan was accompanied to Peshawar by Sirdar Muhammad Rafik Khan, 'the ablest and best adviser' of the Amir. The Amir had sent him to the Commissioner of Peshawar 'with a view to strengthen the alliance'. In his interviews with the Commissioner he put forward the following requests on behalf of the Amir:—

1. 'The friendly alliance and moral support' extended by the British Government to the late Amir might be 'unreservedly continued' to himself.
2. A formal treaty of friendship might be executed between him and the British Government, and it might be made applicable to him and his heirs in perpetuity.[56]
3. In such a treaty the words "now in possession" attached to his title of "ruler of Afghanistan" might be omitted.[57]
4. The fourth request was for 6,000 muskets.

53 *P. P.(A)*, March, 1864, Nos. 201, 250. 54 *Ibid.*, April, 1864, No. 24.

55 *Ibid.*, No. 46.

56 The Amir was prepared to be "perfectly satisfied if he received the assurance that a treaty of friendship would be made with him if he succeeded in consolidating his government."

57 Dost Muhammad had made 'frequent efforts' to have these words omitted.

5. The Amir's eldest son, Sirdar Muhammad Ali Khan, might be styled in correspondence the Heir Apparent ("*Ullee Abud*").[58]

6. An Afghan convict named Hamid Khan (who was sentenced in Calcutta in 1861 to transportation for seven years for receiving stolen property) should be pardoned.[59]

The Government of India, under the guidance of Lord Lawrence, granted the fifth and sixth requests. The fourth request was rejected. No remarks were expressed about the first three requests.[60]

In the meantime the position of the Amir had become more critical than ever.[61] Afzal Khan's preparations were complete. Powerful Sirdars like Amin Khan (Governor of Kandahar), Muhammad Sharif Khan (Governor of Furrah), Fateh Muhammad Khan (ex-Governor of Khelat) and Sultan Muhammad Khan (son of Sadaat Khan, ex-chief of the Mohmands) were anxiously waiting for his approach to Kabul. The British Agent reported that "out of the ten regiments at Kabul and Ghazni, four have refused to support Afzal Khan; the rest, with their officers, and most of the Sirdars, chiefs of tribes, and state officials, have sworn to join him". Azim Khan spread the news that "the British Government had declined to give the Amir any assistance in his quarrel with his family and that Muhammad Rafik Khan had returned from Peshawar without accomplishing his purpose". Naturally the Amir was 'melancholy and worn out'. He 'passed restless nights and only slept a little towards the morning'. But he was not yet ready to take decisive measures or to strike his enemies before they opened the contest.[62]

Towards the close of April the Amir sent 10,000 men and 10 guns under Muhammad Ibrahim Khan and Muhammad Rafik Khan, with orders to await on the frontier the advance of the other party, News was then received of the capture of the fort of Gurdez in Zoormut, belonging to Afzal Khan and left by him with Azim Khan, by one of the Amir's commanders. It was suspected that Azim Khan had purposely left the fort unde-

58 This practice was followed in Dost Muhammad's time.

59 *P. P.*(*A*), May, 1864, No. 77.

60 *Ibid.*, No. 81.

61 The unsettled condition of the country is vividly depicted in the following extract: "Owing to the Amir's attention being drawn to other important matters, thieves have commenced plundering and slaying in the city (Kabul), and are never traced." *P. P.*(*A*), May, 1864, No. 128.

62 *Ibid.*, No. 127.

fended, and the Amir's troops captured it without blood-shed. Be that as it may, the Amir now saw that hostilities could no longer be postponed or avoided. So he decided to march towards Bamian on April 28 and prepared his forces accordingly. The employees and relatives of the hostile Sirdars were seized in Kabul. Those Sirdars whose loyalty was not above suspicion were ordered to accompany the Amir in his march.[63]

Early in May there was a skirmish between some of the Amir's troops and an advanced party of Azim Khan's army in the Peywar Pass, in which the latter were victorious. But Azim Khan was unable to derive any advantage from this preliminary success, for he was 'without the means of paying his men'. The main body of his troops joined the Amir, compelling him to retire to Khost with a small retinue. The Amir was now left free to deal with Afzal Khan.[64]

ANILCHANDRA BANERJEE

63 *P. P.(A)*, May, 1864, No. 128.
64 *Ibid.*, June, 1864, Nos. 40, 41.

Medieval Bengali Narrative Poetry on Historical Themes

Though there is frequent mention of detached historical facts in medieval Bengali narrative peotry, popularly known as the Maṅgala Kāvyas, yet not a single historical poem as a whole was composed prior to the 18th century A.D. For, it was only then, that the rules and regulations governing the standardised type of poetical composition, *viz.*, the Maṅgala Kāvyas became very much slackened, and poetical works began to be composed, disregarding the stereotyped literary standard of Maṅgala Kāvyas. Mention may be made of the historicity of Dharma Maṅgala Kāvyas. But the literary vogue of contemporary Maṅgala Kāvyas was so powerful that though there was scope enough for the composition of suitable historical epics by utilising the subject-matter of Dharma Maṅgala, yet they have been on the whole endowed with the sole characteristics of Kāvya, and their historicity has been wholly concealed behind it. But the history of post-18th century poetical literature of Bengal is different. At that time, as in the sphere of poetical composition, an atmosphere of freedom from the fetters of Maṅgala Kāvyas has come into being as regards the literary vogue, so concerning the subject-matter as well, the actual experience of human life also had begun to find a place therein instead of the dull monotony of divine episodes. As a matter of fact it was then that the few narrative poems on historical themes were composed. But it must also be admitted that most of the conventions of Maṅgala Kāvya have been observed in their composition also.

The first poem that might be mentioned on this subject is *Mahārāṣṭra Purāṇa.*[1] The name of the author is Gaṅgārāma. The actual date of the composition of the work cannot be definitely known, but the manuscript is dated 1672 Śaka, and 1158 B.E. which corresponds to 1751 A.D. The historical incident to which reference has been made in the work is merely 6 or 7 years prior to this time. Hence the date mentioned in the manuscript may be the date of the composition of this poem.

1 Published by Byomkes Mustaphi in *Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrikā* (*SPP.*) 13, pp. 209-36. The only MS. was discovered by the Kedarnath Majumdar from a village in East Mymensingh. (See *SPP.*, 15, p. 253).

The invasion of Bengal by the *Vargis* or Mahratta depredatory robbers in the middle of the 18th century is a notable historical event. Traces thereof may still be found in the nursery songs and folk-literature of West Bengal. It is on this historical event that Gaṅgārāma based his poem. Perhaps only one *Kāṇḍa* (canto) of his poem was written. The name of this *Kāṇḍa* is *Bhāskara Parābhava* (The Retreat of Bhāskara). We shall first describe the story of the poem in brief and then discuss its historical aspect.

Oppressed by the burden of sin, the Earth approached Brahmā and prayed for her deliverance. Brahmā ordered Śiva to rid her of sins. Śiva on his part summoned Nandī and said to him, 'Go down to earth. You will find there in Dakṣinsahar a king named Sāhu. Tell him to destroy the sinners.' Hearing this Nandī lost no time in presenting himself before king Sāhu. King Sāhu approached king Raghu and told him to ask the emperor of Delhi why they had not been receiving any *Cauth* from Bengal for a long time. King Raghu wrote to the emperor of Delhi on this subject. The emperor replied to the following effect:

The vassal has killed the master and usurped the Musnad of Bengal—he does not pay me any *Nazarana.* I have not men enough to remedy this state of things. Two years have passed since I have not had a single *cowrie* from Bengal. The vassal has now become the Nawab and lives free in Bengal. You will do well to send men there for the collection of *Cauth*.

King Raghu placed his Dewan Bhāskara in charge of a vast Mahratta army and sent him to realise *Cauth* from Bengal. Leaving Setara, Bhāskara came to Bijapur and passed a night there. Then he travelled over many districts and reached Nagpur. It was from there that he sent a spy to Bengal and learnt that the Nawab of Bengal lay encamped on the embankment of Ranir dighi in Burdwan.

Keeping Birbhum to the left and passing by Goalabhumi, Bhāskara reached Burdwan on the 19th day of Vaiśākha and laid siege to the town. The Nawab got no inkling of it beforehand. A spy came up to him, and informed him that at the command of king Sāhu, Bhāskara came to realise *Cauth* from Bengal with an army forty thousand strong from the Setara fort.

The Nawab told Mustafa Khan, "Formerly the tributes from Bengal would pass to Delhi; the *Cauth* of the *Vargis* would be realised from the exchequer in Delhi; why have the *Vargis* now come direct to Bengal for that purpose?" Mustafa sent a pleader to Bhāskara to explain his conduct

through him. Bhāskara sent word that the emperor of Delhi had asked them to realise for themselves the *Cauth* from Bengal, so the Nawab might be pleased to pay them *Cauth* voluntarily, otherwise they would loot the country and thus realise the *Cauth* due to them. The Nawab was at a loss as to what to do. The generals suggested that he had rather pay the money to the sepoys through whose help they were sure to put the *Vargis* to the rout. The Nawab readily fell in with the suggestion, and out of joy took up betal leaves from within the betal-box and distributed them among those present. The Nawab's party were at once in dead earnest about adequate preparation.

The party of Bhāskara also got ready for a fight. For seven days the town lay besieged and the miseries of the townsfolk knew no bounds. People could not get out-of-doors for fear of the *Vargis;* food-stuffs became dear, and so they became scarce as well. The poor began to die from starvation. Not to speak of others, the Nawab himself had to carry on a precarious existence by eating the seeds of plantains.

But gradually this besieged condition proved too much for the townsfolk. The Nawab passed orders to find a way out by launching an attack. Mustafa Khan marched against the *Vargis* with a troop of cavalry. The *Vargis* fell back, and attacked his rear-guard. The commander of the rear was Mir Habib. He too fell into straits, and took to his heels. Launching their attack from the rear the *Vargis* set the Nawab's camp on fire. Musaheb Khan, commander of the Nawab, launched a powerful attack upon one of the flanks of the *Vargis,* and made way for the Nawab's flight. The Nawab fled to Katwa along that way. Food-stuffs etc. were sent to the Nawab at Katwa by boat.

Bhāskara ordered the *Vargis* to plunder the town. People began to flee away out of fright, Brahman paṇḍits, Suvarṇavaṇiks, Gandhavaṇiks, braziers, blacksmiths, weavers and fishermen began to flee away with their respective articles. Even the women of the zenana came out on the streets with wicker-work boxes on their heads. The Kṣatriya Rajputs left their swords behind and showed a clear pair of heels. Thus all the surrounding villages were depopulated from the oppressions and molestations of the *Vargis.* Getting into villages, the Vargis began to burn the hearths and homes of people. Gradually when after burning Burdwan town, Chandrakona, Midnapur, Dignagar, Kshirpai, Nimgachi, Sergan, Sikulis, Chandipur and Syampur they reached Hooghly port, Pirkhan, commander of the army,

opposed them and the *Vargis* could not carry on any raids at Hooghly because of him. They took a different route, crossed the Bhagirathi and got to Murshidabad. There they ransacked the house of Jagat Seth. The Nawab's generals Haji Ahmed and Noajis Mohammed succeeded in defending the Nawab's fort with great difficulty. Hearing that Murshidabad was being plundered by the *Vargis*, the Nawab came there from Katwa. On receipt of this news, the *Vargis* cleverly left the city, and fled away. Bhāskara secured two crores and a half of rupees by plundering Jagat Seth's mansion.

Crossing the river Bhāskara went to Katwa and mustered his troops there. Then he pitched a big camp covering Katwa and several villages surrounding it. The rains then set in, and plundering and looting proved out of the question. Bhāskara set about realising tributes from the adjoining areas.

Gradually the month of Āśvin was in, and Bhāskara performed the worship of Durgā with great eclat. In the meantime the *Vargis* constructed a bridge over the Ganges, went across, and got ready to resume their attacks. One day the *Vargis* went over the bridge to a village on the east bank of the river. Hearing this the Nawab fell upon them with sixty thousand horses and one and half lakhs of soldiers. Bhāskara retreated before the overwhelming strength of the Nawab. The soldiers of the Nawab also gave them a chase. At last the *Vargis* went to the other bank over the bridge and destroyed it as soon as they were safe there.

Soldiers were sent from Purnea and Patna to assist the Nawab. The *Vargis* put up a tough resistance as the Nawab was about to cross the river with his army. In the teeth of all opposition the Nawab's army crossed the Ganges by means of ferry-boats and reached the bank of the Ajay. There too arrangements to cross the river were made; but at the time of crossing, the boats sprang a leak and the twenty-two thousand soldiers of the Nawab were compelled to swim ashore. The *Vargis* were seized with fear, and forced to disperse. Consequently they left the land on that occasion.

In the month of Caitra, Bhāskara came back, and invaded Bengal for the second time. This time his oppressions increased, so that Brahmins, cows and women also were put to the sword without any discrimination. On this occasion also he pitched his tent at Katwa. Arriving at the village named Mankar, the Nawab also pitched his tent and got ready to oppose him. A person named Alibhai said to Bhāskara, "Why do you thus come time and again, and destroy your army? Why not preferably decide the

issue with the Nawab?" Bhāskara said, "Very well, you had better approach the Nawab and decide everything." Alibhai went before the Nawab unarmed and submitted to him, "If you kindly allow two of your Sardars to accompany me, I can bring Bhāskara to you and discuss peace-terms with him in your very presence. From the Nawab's side two persons Jānakīrāma and Mustafa Khan went up to Bhāskara at Katwa. They asked Bhāskara to meet the Nawab, but the men of Bhāskara forbade him to do so, whereupon Jāṇakīrāma and Mustafa Khan promised him safety by the holy water of the Ganges, and the Koran, respectively. With only a handful of twenty-two men Bhāskara went forth to interview the Nawab. It was Saturday, the second day of Vaiśākha. Bhāskara presented himself before the Nawab all unarmed. At the end of a little conversation between the two, the Nawab went out on the plea of easing himself. Seeing that he was not coming back as Bhāskara was preparing to get out for the performance of ablutions and worship, the Nawab's men fell upon him, and Bhāskara was killed with his attendants. Then the people inside the Nawab's camp gave themselves up to mirth and merriment.

The efforts of the author as regards the marshalling of historical facts must be admitted to be very praise-worthy, for the incidents mentioned herein have genenral agreement with actual history. Though, therefore, discrepancies may be discerned in one or two places they may practically be ignored. A few such cases are discussed below:

He has mentioned the name of king Sāhu as being the king of "the land in the south." By "the land in the south," he has of course meant the Mahārāṣṭra land in the Deccan. Then again he has committed no mistake in the naming of the Mahratta leaders also. By king Sāhu he had no doubt king Sāhu, grandson of Śivāji, in his mind. This king Sāhu died in 1749 A.D., but even before this he had handed the reins of government over to Bālāji Bājirāo (1740-61). At the time Bhāskara invaded Bengal, king Sāhu was alive. By king Raghu he certainly referred to Raghuji Bhonslā, regent of the Bhonslā family of Berar. It is also an historical fact that during the regime of Balaji Bājirāo the Mahrattas used to get *Cauth* or ¼th of the revenue of Bengal from Delhi.

In 1740 Alivardi became rebellious and usurped the throne of Bengal from Nawab Sarfaraj Khan. Owing to internal disorder the revenue of Bengal could not go to the exchequer in Delhi for two years after it. This was why the Mahrattas also were deprived of their *Cauth*. In 1742, Raghuji

Bhonslā, ruler of Nagpur, sent a detachment under the command of a general, Bhāskara Rām Kolhāṭkar by name, in order to extort tribute from Bengal. The Mahrattas actually occupied some places in West Bengal, and subjected the people to indescribable torture for the sake of exacting money. Alivardi succeeded in putting him to flight with his whole army. In 1744 A.D. Raghuji's general, Bhāskara, invaded Bengal for the second time, but Alivardi Khan killed him treacherously.

If we follow the above history, we find that the facts described by Gaṅgārāma generally agree with it. So this poem of Gaṅgārāma must be admitted to be very valuable as being an almost exact record of a notable historical event of the 18th century. Some of the incidents mentioned in the poem, but not found in history, may not be false, for a description thereof leads one to suppose that the poet was an eye-witness of the incidents or that he collected the account of the incidents from one who had a direct knowledge of them.

The poet has left no account of himself in his work. The late B. K. Mustaphi, publisher of the work, has held that the poet belongs to Rādha.[2] But there is no cogent argument in support of this statement.

Others again have supposed that this Gaṅgārāma is Gaṅgārāma Datta, author of one of the versions of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and an inhabitant of Naḍāil in Jessore.[3] The time of Gaṅgārāma Datta, translator of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, cannot be definitely known. There is a wide gulf of difference between the language of his *Rāmāyaṇa* and that of the *Mahārāṣṭra Purāṇa*. The diction of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is chaste and full of Sanskritism, but *Mahārāṣṭra Purāṇa* is written in the colloquial tongue of East Mymensingh. The style of the composition of one differs widely from that of the other. So it cannot be said that the author of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the writer of *Mahārāṣṭra Purāṇa* are one and the same person.

It should be borne in mind that the only manuscript of *Mahārāṣṭra Purāṇa* has been discovered from East Mymensingh alone, and that it has all the peculiarities of the colloquial tongue of East Mymensingh. The late Mr. Mustaphi has written that the writer of the manuscript in East Bengal has transformed the book into the tongue of East Bengal, but such a radical linguistic transformation of a transcript made within the very life-time of the poet, is an obvious impossibility. If

2 *SPP.*, 13, p. 207. 3 *SPP.*, 46, p. 40.

has also been believed that the manuscript is one written by the poet himself.[4] Hence it can be presumed that the residence of the poet was in East Mymensingh.

It has been said that Gaṅgārāma was an inhabitant of the village Dhārīśvar within Kishorganj sub-division of the Mymensingh district.[5] The descendants of Gaṅgārāma are still living there.

Gaṅgārāma was a Nāyeb under the Dewans of Jaṅgalbārī,[6] the descendants of Dewan Isha Khan. It is believed that during the raids of Murshidabad by the *Vargis* Gaṅgārāma was present at the capital at the time of the payment of revenue on behalf of his masters and as such he was an eyewitness to the incidents there. He must have gathered other information in this connection from different sources during his stay at Murshidabad. And after his return he narrated the incidents in the poem.

Gaṅgārāma has shown fidelity to facts in the marshalling of historical incidents, but he has not attained much success in the poetical excellence of his work. Yet it is a great relief to study Gaṅgārāma's writing which presents a new theme altogether in the midst of the conventional and monotonous poetical literature dealing exclusively with tales of gods and goddesses.

Gaṅgārāma is known to have composed two more small poetical works, *Śuka-saṃvāda* and *Lava-Kuśa-caritra* in his old age.[7]

Next must be mentioned *Mānasiṃha Kāvya,*[8] the author of which is Bhāratcandra, a great poet of the 18th century. This poem was composed in 1752 A.D. Though externally *Mānasiṃha* forms part of Bhāratcandra's *Annadā Maṅgala,* yet it is a distinct piece of work. According to the practice of this country, Bhāratcandra has included three separate episodes in the same poem, but their distinctness from one another is easily discernible. The first episode of Bhāratcandra's *Annadā Maṅgala* deals with deities, the second treats of human character, while the third, i.e., the *Mānasiṃha* relates to history. The last-mentioned poem is also quite new in Bengali literature as regards the subject-matter and literary technique. Herein the poet has shown his fidelity to facts, and knowledge of history.

4 *SPP.*, 15, p. 250.

5 Kedarnath Majumdar, *Maymansiṃher Vivaraṇ*, Mymensingh, 1st Ed., p. 73.

6 *SPP.*, 15, p. 250.

7 *Ibid.*

8 Bhāratcandra, *Granthāvalī,* Ed., Vasumati, Calcutta, 14th impression, no date, pp. 115-143.

But then this must also be admitted that *Mānasiṃha* is first a poem and then a history. All the peculiar features of medieval Bengali Maṅgala Kāvya are partially there as its external embellishments. In all those matters on which the poet did not have a clear knowledge of history he has perhaps drawn upon tradition or even his own imagination here and there. Still his fidelity to historical facts throughout the poem is commendable.

The poet has named his work after a famous historical person, Mānasiṃha, the Rajput general of the Moghul emperor Akbar. This poem has been based on the incident of Mānasiṃha's arrival in Bengal. Mukundarāma, the poet of *Caṇḍī Maṅgala* also, has alluded to the event of Mānasiṃha's arrival in Bengal.

In this poem we come across such historical characters as Jahangir, Mānasiṃha, Pratāpāditya and Bhavānanda. It is about the last three of them that some historical facts have been given. Judged in the light of actual history it is found that the stories relating to Mānasiṃha or Pratāpāditya do not possess much value. The real purpose of the poem is to describe the glories of Bhavānanda Majumdār, predecessor of king Kṛṣṇacandra of Navadvīpa, a patron of the poet. Bhavānanda, founder of the royal line of Navadvīpa, was none other than a celestial being who was fallen from heaven and who came down to earth with a view to propagate the worship of the deity. The purpose of the poet was to describe the greatness and prosperity of this Bhavānanda who was a devotee of the goddess and his acquisition of a kingdom, and to narrate the story of Kṛṣṇacandra's predecessors. Herein the poet has adopted the conventional literary vogue of the Maṅgala Kāvyas. Yet in reality its historical value also deserves recognition in a considerable measure. Judged in this light it should be said that this poem had better have been styled "*Bhavānanda.*" This episode has been named after Mānasiṃha perhaps because a great historical person like him has been associated with it—there can be no other significance of this designation. Pratāpāditya has been brought in only to lend some prominence to Mānasiṃha. Pratāpāditya actually occupies only a secondary place in the narrative. The small episode about Jahangir which the work contains is not only fictitious, but antagonistic to fact also. The historical story contained in *Mānasiṃha Kāvya* is given below in brief.

After the murder of Vasanta Rāya by Pratāpāditya, king of Jessore, his son Kacu Rāya lodged a complaint against him with emperor Jahangir. Jahangir sent Mānasiṃha to put down Pratāpāditya. Mānasiṃha came to

Burdwan accompanied by Kacu Rāya. Bhavānanda was then a Kanungo (a revenue officer of a lower order). He came to Burdwan and interviewed Mānasiṃha. Mānasiṃha heard everything about Bengal from him. On his way to Jessore Mānasiṃha came to Bāgoyān, the residence of Bhavānanda. Here the soldiers of Mānasiṃha were hard put to, because of rain and storm. Through the grace of Annadā, Bhavānanda saved Mānasiṃha from this difficulty. On his way to Jessore Mānasiṃha took Bhavānanda too with him. He made Pratāpāditya a prisoner of war, and marched back towards Delhi with him. On the way Pratāpāditya died from starvation. Out of gratitude for Bhavānanda, Mānasiṃha presented him before the emperor in Delhi. Armed with full particulars about Bhavānanda it was upon him that Jahangir bestowed the *firman* of kingship. The poet has described through the mouth of Annapūrṇā all that was to come about in future in the lives of those of Bhavānanda's family who reigned after him.

The poet has narrated the episode very briefly. As already said, the chief motive lying behind the composition of this poem was to sing the praise of Bhavānanda, the predecessor of Kṛṣṇacandra. In doing so the poet was forced to usher in Mānasiṃha and Pratāpāditya. A gap of only five generations or 100 to 125 years lies between Bhavānanda and Kṛṣṇacandra, and Bhāratcandra was the court-poet of Kṛṣṇacandra himself; hence we can claim from him the historicity of the story relating to Bhavānanda.

Let us see first of all whence the poet has gathered the materials for the composition of his narrative. The system of writing history according to the modern scientific method was not in vogue in our country. A sort of genealogical work known as *'Ghaṭaker Puthi'* was in circulation in our country, from which some account of many noted families can be derived. Such works do not generally cover more than 150 to 200 years. These works are as a rule based upon traditional accounts. It is with the help of the materials culled from these pseudo-genealogical works that *Kṣitīśavaṃśāvalī* and this poem of Bhāratacandra were composed during the period of Kṛṣṇacandra's reign. Bhāratcandra has incorporated in his poem all these traditional accounts extant in his time. He did not care to write his poem with an eye to historical facts, nor had he any such mentality either. If he had, he could have got together many historical facts in regard to the narrative connected with Bhavānanda, for he had opportunities enough for doing so. The modern historians of *Nadiā-kāhinī* and History of Jessore and Khulna etc., have also uncritically accepted the stories described in *Kśitīśavamśāvalī*

and *Mānasiṃha* as being true. But it may be said that final decision has been arrived at the historical character of the story relating to Mānasiṃha, Bhavānanda and Pratāpāditya through the researches of some more modern historians. We shall examine the historicity of Bhāratcandra in the light of these researches.[9]

The real defect of Bhāratcandra lies in the description of the fight etc., between Pratāpāditya and Mānasiṃha. Through modern researches it has been found that there was no fight between Pratāpāditya and Mānasiṃha. It was against the soldiers of Islam Khan that Mānasiṃha fought. Detailed accounts of the wars of the Moghul army with such rebellious land-lords as Katlu Khan, Suleman, Osman, Isa Khan, Kedar Rāya etc., during the times of Akbar and Jehangir are on record in such works as *Ākbār-nāmā, Ikbāl-nāmā-i-Jehāngirī, Munta-khābuttawarikh, Makhjān-i-āfganā* etc., but none of them contains any account of Pratāpāditya. The account of Pratāpāditya is found written only in the work of "*Bāhār-i-stān.*" The author of the work is Mirja Nathan, one of the generals of Islam Khan. He has left on record a day-to-day account in the form of a diary. It is seen therefrom that Pratāpāditya's father and he too showed allegiance to the Moghuls. From *Bāhār-i-stān* it can be learnt that in 1607 A.D. Islam Khan came to put down the independent landlords of Bengal. At that time Pratāpāditya first sent his son and minister, and then he also appeared before him, paid homage to him and promised to help him. But in 1611 A.D. in his fight with Osman, Islam Khan did not receive adequate help from Pratāpāditya. Hence in 1612, the soldiers of Islam Khan marched against Pratāpāditya. This expedition passed through Bāgoyān. In this fight Pratāpāditya was made prisoner and taken to Dacca. Nothing more can be known about Pratāpāditya after this. Mānasiṃha left Bengal in 1606 A.D. never to return, and the truth of history is that Prātāpāditya met with his reverses five or six years later.

Nothing can be known from authentic history about Bhavānanda. What Bhāratcandra has said about him may, however, be generally true. I[t] is quite natural that Bhavānanda met Mānasiṃha when the latter came t[o] Burdwan. He was the Zeminder of 2 or 3 Perganas, a vassal of the Moghuls and the Kanungo of Hooghly besides. There is no historical evidence o[f]

9 I derived great help from the article written by Dr. N. K. Bhattasa[li] entitled *Pratāpādityer Kathā* published in the *Bhāratavarṣa,* Phālgun, 1339 B.[S.] pp. 353-363 in connection with this discussion.

Mānasiṃha's arrival at Bāgoyān. It is not a fact that Bhavānanda got the entire extensive zemindary from Mānasiṃha. The two *firmans* given by Jahangir which constitute the original documents of the zemindary of Krishnanagar have been preserved to this day. The first one is dated 1606 A.D., from which it can be learnt that Bhavānanda got from Mānasiṃha a pergana named Mahmudpur. It can be presumed that it was quite natural that Bhavānanda should come into possession of the thinly-populated pergana adjacent to his zemindary; for this the fictitious story of his help in the fight against Pratāpāditya need not have been concocted at all. The second *firman* is dated 1613 A.D. i.e., it was given after the fall of Pratāpāditya. It may be that Bhavānanda may have rendered some sort of help when Islām Khan's expedition passed through Bāgoyān—although there is no mention of it either in *Bāhār-i-stān* or the said *firman*—and it was in recompense for this that he got this time seven more perganas. Bhavānanda sent his two brothers Durgādās and Rāy Vasanta to Delhi and had the first document brought by them from there. There is no evidence on record to show that he himself went to Delhi, though there is much probability about it. The story of Pratāp's interview with Mānasiṃha is not to be found in any authentic history.

Bhāratcandra has stated that on the eve of his invasion of Jessore, Mānasiṃha sent a fetter and a sword to Pratāpāditya and asked him through his ambassador to choose either of them. By way of reply to this challenge, Pratāpāditya said the following to be communicated by the ambassador:

> Go and say, oh ambassador, to Mānasiṃha Rāy that he may put the fetters round the foot of his master. I choose to accept the sword. Go and tell him that I shall wash this in the waters of the Jumna.[10]

Such a heroic statement on the part of Pratāpāditya whether directed at Mānasiṃha or Islam Khan must be treated as a stroke of poetic fancy. Such a statement can be met with in the life-stories of several other heroic characters also. Besides, we know also of Pratāp's fealty to the Moghuls.

The story of Pratāpāditya's strength consisting of fifty-two thousand soldiers armed with shields[11] etc., is no doubt the product of the poet's imagination. According to the account given in the itenerary of Abdul Latif it is found that Pratāp had 20,000 soldiers and 700 war-vessels.

The poet has given proof of his knowledge of history in the brief

10 Bhāratcandra, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

11 Bhāratcandra, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

account of the Kṛṣṇanagar royal line presented by him at the close of the book in connection with the prophecy regarding the successors to the throne. From that account it can be learnt that Bhavānanda was to be succeeded by Gopāla and Gopāla would be succeeded by Rāghava. Of this Rāghava, Bhāratcandra has made Annapūrṇā say:

"There was the king Depālkumār in Degāon. He was famous throughout the world. He has now been killed through my artifice. I shall bestow his kingdom on Rāghava."[12]

Devapāl, who came of the weaver class, was the king of Devagrām. Mr. Kumudnath Mallik, author of *Nadiā Kāhinī*, says,—'It cannot be ascertained how much of history there is behind this tradition in regard to Devapāl.'[13] But it seems to be certain that after the destruction of the Devapāl dynasty, their property passed into the hands of king Rāghava.

Of Rāghava, it has further been said—

He will found the village Dighinagar. He will have a big tank excavated and then he will set up the image of Śaṅkar. His son Rudra Rāya will then become king and he will add to his possessions through my grace.[14]

All these are historical truths. Rudra Rāya considerably increased the extent of the zemindary. Rudra Rāya had three sons Rāmacandra, Rāmajīvana and Rāmakṛṣṇa. Bhāratcandra writes,—

Rāmakṛṣṇa will be the youngest but his bearing will be the finest. After the death of Rāmacandra, kingship will go to him. He will triumph over such kings as Śobhāsiṃha etc. He will acquire the appellation of "Somayājī" by performing the triennial sacrifice in which the juice of the moon plant is drunk. This small wicker-work box of mine will be insulted by him through vanity, and I shall leave him for that offence on his part. I shall take him to the royal court, and have him murdered. I shall then be pleased to confer the kingdom on Rāmajīvana.[15]

Here the poet has epitomised a lengthy historical narrative in a few words. The historical facts referred to in the above lines are as follows: Rudra Rāya chose his youngest son Rāmakṛṣṇa his successor, as he was the fittest of the lot. But on his death his eldest brother Rāmacandra seized the paternal zemindary through the Faujdar (police officer) of Hooghly and the Nawab of Dacca. Once Rāmajīvana mustered strength enough to dispossess him, but soon he was expelled by his elder brother. On the death of Rāma-

12 Bhāratcandra, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
13 Ranaghat, 1319 B.E., p. 27.
14 Bhāratcandra, *Ibid.*, p. 142.
15 Bhāratcandra, *op. cit.*

candra, Rāmajīvana seized the kingdom for the second time, but in no time he was sent to prison by the Nawab of Dacca through the machinations of his step-brother Rāmakṛṣṇa. Ill-feeling grew up between king Rāmakṛṣṇa and Nawab Mursid Kuli Khan for some reason. This was why he made Rāmakṛṣṇa prisoner at Dacca. When he died in prison in dire distress and misery, his step-brother Rāmajīvana was released from jail, and he got back the kingdom of Nadia.

Towards the close of the 17th century Śobhā Siṃha became powerful in Burdwan, and killed Kṛṣṇarāma, Mahārājā of Burdwan. The prince Jagat Rāya fled away and took refuge with Rāmakṛṣṇa. Śobhā Siṃha sent his troops towards Murshidabad and Nadia, but they were defeated at the hands of Rāmakṛṣṇa.

Rāmajīvana had four sons, Rājārāma, Kṛṣṇarāma, Raghurāma and Rāmagopāla. Of them Raghurāma became king. Mahārāja Kṛṣṇacandra was the son of this Raghurāma. In connection with Kṛṣṇacandra it has been said—

There will be raids of the *Vargis* in this country in the Śaka Era represented by the (16) Mātṛkās at the beginning and the (64) Yoginīs at the end (i.e. 1664 Śaka Era or 1742 A.D.). Alivardi will then carry off Kṛṣṇacandra as a prisoner and demand the sum of twelve lakhs of rupees as *nazarana* (present).[16]

The detailed description of Alivardi Khan's accession to power and the raids of the *Vargis* has been given by the poet in the introductory chapter of the book. The poet has given ample evidence of his knowledge of history in this description, for these took place during the life-time of the poet. Alivardi was reduced to straits because of the raids of the *Vargis*, the royal exchequer became empty. As Kṛṣṇacandra failed to pay his paternal debt of ten lakhs of rupees and his own *nazarana* of two lakhs of rupees he was incarcerated. But he was very soon in a position to be released by discharging his debts through the efficient management of the estate by his minister Raghunandana Mitra.

In conclusion it should be stated that the system of writing actual history not being prevalent in this country, the poets could not develop the vision of real historians. Had Bhāratcandra any liking for, and attachment to, historical facts he could have left behind an authoritative history on

16 Bhāratcandra, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

Kingship in the Ṛgveda

Origin of Vedic Kingship

From the beginning of recorded history kingship is an establishe institution in Indian society. Among kings mentioned in *Maṇḍalas* II-V belonging to the older strata of the *Ṛgveda* are Abhyāvartin Cāyamān Sṛñjaya Daivarāta, Sāhadevya Somaka, Tūrvayāṇa, Purukutsa and his sc Trasadasyu of the Pūru line, and last but not the least Divodāsa and h son Sudās of the Bharata stock.[1] The Vedic people themselves, when r flecting at a later date on the origin of kingship, could think of its divir prototype Indra or Varuṇa as having been created by the Highest Deit Prajāpati or else elected by the gods on the score of superior merit.[2] A sti later tradition, evidently distorted by the Greek's projection of the earl history of his own land into India's unfamiliar remote past, is recorded b Megasthenes. According to this tradition Dionysius (according to anoth account Heracles) with his descendants ruled India for 'many years' (accorc ing to the alternative account, 'for many generations') and thereafter mo: of the cities adopted the democratic form of government.[3] The true origi

1 Even the non-Aryans with whom the Ṛgvedic people came in contact aı mentioned as having chiefs or kings e.g. Pramaganda (a prince of the Kīkaṭas) an the Dāsa chiefs Ilibiśa, Cumuri, Dhuṅi, Pipru and Varcin.

2 See *Hindu Political Theories* by the present writer, 2nd ed. pp. 25-26. T the references there given add the following. *T.B.* II. 2. 7. 2 tells us how Prajāpat created the gods and the Asuras but not Indra who was created only afterward at the request of the gods. *Ibid.*, II. 2. 10. 1 ff. says more directly how Indra wa created *adhipati* of the gods by Prajāpati. In *P.B.* XV. 3. 30 we read how the god at first did not yield sovereignty (*rājya*) to Varuṇa, but they yielded the sam to him when he 'saw' a particular chant. More detailed is the story in *J.B.* III. 15 (=*Das Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl*, No. 188). There we are told how Varuṇ was originally the equal, as it were, of other deities. Desiring to be consecrated t kingship (*rājya*) over all the deities, he became the pupil of Prajāpati who taught hin a particular chant. When he next approached the gods, they found in him th form of their Father Prajāpati and putting him on the king's seat consecrated hin to various royalties.

3 McCrindle, *Ancient India as described by Megasthenes and Arrian*, Calcutt edition, pp. 35-36. In K. P. Jayaswal's quotation (*Hindu Polity*, Pt. 1, p. 25) th suggestion of Greek influence is destroyed by the author's unwarranted change o 'cities' in the original passage into 'places.'

of Vedic monarchy is probably to be sought primarily in the military and other necessities of the people during the Indo-Iranian or even earlier times.[4]

Attributes of Kingship

The Ṛgvedic monarchy appears as yet in the tribal stage. This is proved conclusively by the fact that the king is often known simply by the tribal name, e.g. Yadu Turvaśa. It was not till the period of the *Yajus Saṃhitās* that the concept of territorial monarchy dawned upon the Indo-Aryans.[5]

Kingship in the Ṛgvedic times was evidently a position of the highest dignity. Repeatedly in the *Ṛgveda* the honorific epithet *rājan* is applied to the great gods Indra, Mitra, Varuṇa, Agni, Bṛhaspati, Soma and Yama as well as the multiple deities Ādityas, Aśvins and so forth.[6] Still more significant is the repeated application of similes about kingship with reference to the gods. To take a few examples, in I. 67. 1 Agni is said to claim obedience like a king.[7] Even the king's movements are held out as objects of comparison with those of the gods. Thus I. 130. 1 opens with an invocation to Indra to come like a legitimate lord to the council of the wise, like a king and legitimate lord to the house.[8] In IV. 4. 1 Agni is said to march out like a mighty king with his retainers (or according to another interpretation, with his elephants).[9] In IX. 7. 5 and X. 43. 2 Soma and Indra respectively are said to sit like a king.[10] Similarly in VII. 18. 2

4 According to Zimmer. *Altindisches Leben* (p. 162), Vedic monarchy was the necessary outcome of patriarchal origin of 'the Aryan State.' Rejecting this view the authors of *Vedic Index s.v. rājan,* derive it, on the analogy of the Aryan invaders of Greece and German invaders of Britain, from the position of the Vedic Aryans as invaders in a hostile territory. But this analogy itself is inconclusive, as it has been recently proved (Hodgkin, *History of the Anglo-Saxons,* vol. I, p. 215) that kingship at least among the Angles existed long before their migration to Britain.

5 For references see *The Beginnings of Indian Historiography and other Essays* by the present writer, p. 263.

6 For references see Griffith's tr. of the *Ṛgveda,* Indexes to vols. I & II, *s.v.*

7 'In den Wäldern Sieger, unter Menschen der Freund, beansprucht er wie der König Gehorsam ohne nachzulassen.' Geldner, *Der Rigveda,* p. 79.

8 'Indra! Komm aus der Ferne zu uns in eigner Person her, wie ein rechtmässiger Gebieter zum Rate der Weisen, Wie ein König und rechtmässiger Gebieter nach Hause.' Geldner, *op. cit,* pp. 164-65.

9 *Ibha* in the original translated as 'retainer' by most scholars, but as 'elephant' by Geldner.

10 *Rājeva sīdati* and *rājeva dasma niṣadaḥ.*

Indra is said to dwell like a king among his wives. In the same spirit the king's physical aspect is compared with that of the gods. In I. 85. 8 it is said of the Maruts that they are, like kings, men of over-powering aspect.[11] The brilliant picture of Varuṇa wearing a golden mantle and clad in new robes and sitting surrounded by his spies (I. 25. 10 ff.), as Zimmer[12] pointed out long ago, must have been drawn from life.[13] Elsewhere X. 78. 1 the Maruts are compared with splendid kings of beautiful aspect.

The splendour of the king's aspect and raiment mentioned in the texts last-quoted was only the outward expression of his unexampled prosperity. The huge lists of gifts mentioned in the *Dānastutis* of the *Ṛgveda*,[14] after making due allowance for the exaggerations of the poets, testify to the king's extensive possessions of slaves, horses and cattle, along with chariots, ornaments and the like.

Endowed as it was with high dignity and prosperity, the position of the Ṛgvedic king was also one of great authority. The *Ṛgveda* even in its older parts is familiar with the three technical terms indicative of the king's dominion or authority, viz., *rājya*, *rāṣṭra* and above all *kṣatra*. These terms have already acquired sufficient importance to be freely applied to the gods.[15] *Rāṣṭra* and *Kṣatra*, again, are sufficiently significant to form the subject of prayer on behalf of kings.[16] The essence of the king's authority, namely

11 'Wie die Könige sind die Männer von überwältigendem Anblick.' Geldner, *op. cit.*, p. 99.

12 *Op. cit.*, p. 167.

13 'Varuṇa, der Gesetzvollstrecker, hat sich in den Gewässern niedergelassen zur Ausübung der Herrschaft, der Klugsinnige.........Einen goldenen Mantel trägt Varuṇa und legt ein neues Gewand an. Rings herum sitzen seine Späher.' Geldner, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

14 See especially *maṇḍala* VII.

15 Cf. VII. 6. 2. referring to *rājya* of God Agni, VII. 34. 11 addressing Varuṇa as *rājā rāṣṭrāṇāṇ*, X. 125. 3 applying to the Goddess of Speech the epithet *rāṣṭrī* and VII. 84. 2 mentioning the high dominion (*rāṣṭraṃ bṛhat*) of Indra and Varuṇa. The 'high dominion (*mahi kṣatram*) of Indra is referred to in VII. 28. 3, VII. 30. 1., etc., his 'supreme dominion (*asuryaṃ kṣatraṃ*) in VII. 21. 7. The 'high dominion' of Savitar is mentioned in I. 24. 6 and that of Agni in IV. 12. 3, the 'resplendent dominion' (*jyotiṣmat kṣatraṃ*) of the Ādityas in I. 136. 3. In I. 136. 1 reference is made to the *kṣatra* as well as *devatva* of Mitra and Varuṇa. The epithet *kṣatraśrī* ('der die Herrschaft zu Ehren bringt.' Geldner, *op. cit.*, p. 23) is applied to Varuṇa in I. 25. 5.

16 Thus in X. 173 the poet prays on behalf of a newly consecrated king that his *rāṣṭra* may not fall away, that he may hold the *rāṣṭra* in his grasp, that Soma

11 in the sense of a police official, this would be a decisive proof of criminal jurisdiction of the king in Ṛgvedic times. But unhappily this explanation, has not been generally accepted.

It is probable that the frequent references to the laws of Varuṇa (or of Varuṇa and Mitra) and guarding of the same by these deities imply that the earthly king was entitled to issue and enforce his decrees. Among such references may be mentioned I. 24. 10 referring to Varuṇa's holy laws (*adabdhāni varuṇasya vratāni*), I. 25. 10 applying to Varuṇa the epithet of *dhṛtavrata* and X. 10. 6. indicating greatness of the law of Varuṇa and Mitra (*bṛhanmitrasya varuṇasya dhāma*).[21]

From the frequent references to wars between Āryas and Dāsas as well as those between the Āryas themselves, it may be inferred that one of the king's main functions was to exercise the supreme command in war. It is not without significance that the most famous of the Ṛgvedic wars, viz. that between Sudās and a confederate host, is known in three *Ṛgveda* passages (VII. 33. 3 and 5; *ibid.*, 83. 8) as *dāśarājña* ('the battle with the ten kings'). In the simile of a warrior-king leading his army's wings (X. 75. 4) we have a direct reference to the king's exercise of his military command.

In a number of epithets applied to the great gods in the *Ṛgveda,* we have, as it were, in solution one of the most characteristic functions of the king in the late Vedic as well as Smṛti-Arthaśāstra State, viz., his guardianship of the Sacred Law. Among these epithets is *dhṛtavrata* applied to Mitra and Varuṇa and less often to Agni, Indra and Savitar.[22] The equivalent epithet *vratapāḥ* is applied to Agni in VIII. 11. 1. Of the same nature is the designation *adhyakṣaḥ dharmaṇām* applied to Indra in VIII. 43. 24. In later times *VS*. X. 27 used the Ṛgvedic verse I. 25. 10 (applying *dhṛtavrata* to Varuṇa) in a Rājasūya formula and this in its turn was transferred by *Ś.Br*. V. 4. 3. 12 to the earthly king, so as to make the latter the upholder of the sacred law (*dhṛtavrata*). Again, *AB*. VII. 13 applied to the king the epithet *dharmasya goptā* evidently by transference of *adhyakṣaḥ dharmaṇām* designating Indra in the Ṛgvedic passage just cited.

21 Other references are V. 69. 1 where Mitra and Varuṇa are said to guard the ordinance that lasts for ever and VIII. 25. 8 where they are declared to have obtained their sway as rulers whose laws stand fast.

22 The title *dhṛtavrata* is applied to Varuṇa in I. 25. 8 and 10, I. 44. 14, I. 141. 9, II. 1. 4, X. 65. 5 etc. It is applied to Mitra and Varuṇa in I. 15. 6, VIII. 25. 2 and 8, VIII. 27. 3. In VI. 68. 10 it applies to Indra and Varuṇa, in VIII. 44. 25 to Agni, in VI. 19. 5 to Indra, in IV. 53. 4 to Savitar.

Limitations of Ṛgvedic kingship

Though invested with important attributes and credited with the exercise of high civil and military functions, the early Vedic kingship was far from being absolute. To begin with, the conception of the omnipotent divine law (*vrata* or *dhāman*) and the all-powerful custom (*dharma* or *dharman*) ruled out from the first the king's claim to legislation. In the graded classification of the four castes, again, unconnected with the concept of *Dharma,* we have a distant parallel of the Anglo-Saxon folk-right fixing the status as well as the privileges and obligations of each class by virtue of its membership of the folk.[23] We have next to mention the distinctive feature of the Vedic State, viz. that not only was the conception of public sacrifices alien to the genius of the people, but that the priestly function was from the first differentiated from the royal.[24] We may point also to the undefined check which the Vedic *sabhā* and *samiti* probably imposed upon the king.

Kingship in the *Ṛgveda,* as in later times, was anything but secure. The danger from rivals and enemies is repeatedly referred to in a royal coronation hymn (X. 174) of the last Ṛgvedic stratum. The immediately preceding hymn (X. 173) embodies in a series of pregnant similes the poet's passionate prayer for stability of the royal rule. May not, says the poet, the king's sway (*rāṣṭra*) fall away, may the king be steadfast (*dhruva*) and immovable (*avicācaliḥ*) like the mountain, like the god Indra, like the sky and earth and so on.

Summary

Dim and indistinct as is the picture of kingship presented by the *Ṛgveda Saṃhitā,* we can broadly distinguish some of its principal features. We have first to note that no particular sanctity was attached to the king's person or family, there being only one recorded and evidently exceptional instance of a king being described as a demi-god. Still more significant is the fact that the king's function was from the first differentiated from that of the priest, while the conception of a public priesthood was practically un-

23 For the Anglo-Saxon Folk-right see Joliffe, *The Constitutional History of Mediaeval England,* p. 5.

24 For criticism of Zimmer's view *op. cit.,* pp. 195-96 that the king's sons could act as *purohita,* see *Vedic Index, s.v.* varṇa and Devāpi.

known. The king's authority was indicated thus early by a number of technical terms and it implied at least the submission of the people to his will. The king was evidently the highest executive authority and the supreme commander in war, and was perhaps already in control of the criminal jurisdiction. Kingship, then, was essentially a magistracy charged with exercise of the highest administrative and military functions. In fact we have in *Ṛgveda* a number of titles of royal officers—*grāmaṇī, senānī* and perhaps also *madhyamaśī* and *jīvagṛbh*—as well as technical terms like *bali,* pointing to the rudiments of an administrative machinery. From the importance attached to divine law and custom we can safely infer that these operated as checks on the king's authority. Restraints of a constitutional character were probably imposed by the existence of the Vedic Councils and Assemblies, but these unfortunately cannot be defined for want of data.

U. N. GHOSHAL

Śivavilasa

(A semi-historical poem)

From the title of the poem, it would appear that this deals with the story of God Śiva. The transcript of this work in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras (R. 5,146) is described as "a story of Śiva." Although it has something to do with Śiva, it is really a historical kāvya, dealing with the marriage of the daughter of the king of Kāyaṅkulam, a part of the modern Travancore State, with a prince of the royal family at Tiruvañcikkulam, called Perumpaṭappu, which is the present Cochin Royal family.

The poem contains eight sargas. It is a very beautiful composition, simple, elegant and fluent in style. The descriptions are realistic and impressive and the narration is attractive. The author is one Dāmodara, belonging to the class of professional actors, the Cākyārs. The work is dedicated to Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa, in so far as the poem in styled "rudranārāyaṇīya." Whether it is due to the dual deity of Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa being his iṣṭadevatā or to his father or uncle or teacher having the name of Rudranārāyaṇa, one cannot at present definitely say. The poem bears the name of Śivavilāsa. The facts about the author are given in the concluding verse:

इति महितपदाब्जे रुद्रनारायणीये मधुलिह इव वृत्तिं बिभ्रता चातकस्य (?) ।
अलघु शिवविलासं(सो) नाम काव्यं बबन्धे सुरभिभरतगोत्रीयेण दामोदरेण ॥

The Descriptive Catalogue of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, suggests that the name Rudranārāyaṇa refers to the author's teacher.

There is a brief description of this work in Malayalam, published in the Quarterly Journal of the Pan-Kerala Literary Academy in August-September, 1934. But no information is available in English except the short notice in the Catalogue of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras. The author of this work, Dāmodara, is known to have written a Malayālam work also in the style called Campū (i.e., mixture of prose and metrical passages) dealing with the same story. But on a comparison of the Sanskrit work with the Malayālam work, it is found that except for the bare outline of the story, there is no comparison at all. The fact of Dāmodara being the author of the Malayālam work, is taken on the

authority of Rao Sahib Ulloor S. Parameswara Ayyar of Trivandrum, the well known scholar and poet of Malabar. I have not seen the work itself; but it is described in Malayālam Journals.

There are other similar instances of such affinities between two works in Malayālam and Sanskrit. There is a poem called *Koṭiviraha*, ascribed to Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa of Malabar, and published in the Kāvyamālā Series in Gucchaka V. There is also a Malayālam Campū bearing the same name, and composed by Mahiṣamaṅgala. Here also there are considerable variations in the story as between the two works.

Śivavilāsa contains eight cantos, like the genuine portion of Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava*. Though the author specifically mentions Kālidāsa's *Raghuvaṃśa*, yet on the whole the work has more similarity with the *Kumārasambhava* in treatment and plan.

The work begins with a *maṅgala* as follows:

सलिलशिखिनभस्वत्सम्पदो या नभःश्रीरिव स्वयति लोके सौख्य(दुःख)प्रमोहान्(दान्)
स्वयमविकृतिरेतैरिन्दुरेखातरङ्गैरिव तनुभिरनेका सावताद्देवता नः । 1

Then there is a glorification of great men in:

सन्तो नाम बहुश्रुता दधति चेन्निर्मत्सरां शेमुषीं
नान्यत् प्रस्तुतदोषभेषजपदे जागर्ति तत्सेवनात् ।
तेभ्योऽयं घटितोऽञ्जलिर्यदनघा हीनापि तैरीडिता
कामं स्याद्गुणगर्हिणी तदपि वाग्वन्ध्या च तद्गर्हिता ॥ 2

Then, the author mentions the *Raghuvaṃśa* as the ideal before him in writing this poem:

स्फुरति मृगयाजाले सिंहाद्यलङ्घ्यतमे पुरः
स्वगुणकलया लूना(ता)प्येतत्तनोति यथा तथा ।
अलघु रघुवंशाद्यं पश्यन् विधित्सितकाव्यता-
महमपि दधे मन्दात्माहो विमोहमहात्मना ॥ 3

There follows an apology for any defects in his poem::

अपि चापलमित्यमुं विजानन्नजिहासुर्यदुपक्रमं तदर्थम् ।
विषयस्य गुणैर्निजं प्रबन्धं सुरभीकर्तुमनास्ततो जनोऽयम् ॥ 4

After a prayer to the readers in:

विषयविहृतिविस्तोषात्मनोर्भुक्तिमुक्त्योर्गतिरभयनिदानं भूतनाथे च भक्तेः ।
चरितमपि च शैवं वर्ण्यतेऽस्मिंस्तदङ्ग तत इदमिह सास्थाः सन्तु सन्तो विदन्तः । 5

the story begins with the description of the Śiva temple in the city of Kaṇṭiyūr in Malabar:

यत्रस्थेन जगत्कृता यदुवृषाः संघोषयन्त्यात्मनः
सानाथ्यं समरापराङ्मुखतमास्ते संमताः काहलैः ।

कृष्णो यत्स्तुतिहेतुरस्ति विदितं तत्केरलेष्वाततं
शैवं धाम सुधाम शैवलपुरं नामाश्रयः श्रेयसाम् ॥6

Śaivala means Kaṇṭi (also Caṇṭi) and pura means ūr. Thus Śaivalapura means Kaṇṭiyūr. Then there are twelve verses (from 7 to 18) where this city is described. I am quoting a few verses as specimens of the poem.

नक्तं कोविदनर्तकीविरचितं नाट्यं रसैकाग्रयतो
दृष्ट्वा निर्निमिषाः प्रसन्नवदना निष्पन्दतामागताः ।
तत्संस्कारबलात् कृता इव दिवाप्याभान्ति भित्त्यादिके
यत्रालेख्यगताश्च दैवतगणा नृत्तालये नित्यशः ॥ 9
यस्मिन् वेदविदः कलङ्करहिता विप्राः शतं नित्यशः
संमृष्टान्न(म्र)भुजः क्रमाद्गृहपतौ तीर्णे विभागं दिवः ।
सम्यक्पूजितशम्भुवन्दनकृतो निस्संख्यशंखस्वनैः
सन्नद्धं मुदिता भजन्ति महितं मा(म)ध्यन्दिनश्रीबलिम् ॥ 14
चित्रच्छलचयेऽपि दृष्टिपथगे प्रेष्यप्रभूणां प्रभो-
र्यत्र प्राक्तनमुत्सवेषु कलुषं दूरान्नृणां शाम्यति ।
मुक्त्यै वीक्षणधूरधः स्थितवतः श्वेतातपत्रोत्तमा-
द्विष्वक्सन्ततसिन्धुरेन्द्रपटलीदृश्यस्य विश्वेशितुः ॥ 16
कन्या यत्र महोत्सवे कनकदीपोद्यत्कराम्भोरुहा
धन्या जृम्भितयौवनाश्च वनितास्ताम्बूलवीटीहृतः ।
अम्भोजैरिव संप्रकीर्य सुभगापाङ्गैरनङ्गाच्छगं-
गाम्भीर्यं विधुवन्ति किञ्चन विभोरप्यग्रपश्चाद्भुवोः ॥ 17

In this city there was a king named Kerala:

तस्मिन्नासीत् प्रशस्ते त्रिजगति मतिमान् शेखरः(रं) केरलानां
दिक्चक्रे विक्रमाविष्कृतजयपटहः केरलो नाम राजा ।
यस्यास्त्रैर्भग्नशीर्षा(शेषा) रणभुवि विमुखाः शत्रवो मुक्तशस्त्रा-
श्चक्रुः कान्तारकन्दोत्खननसहकरं शस्त्रमेवात्महस्ते ॥ 19

The remaining portion of the first canto is practically taken up with a description of this king, which extends to verse 32. In the next verse, there is the mention of his minister Kṛṣṇavīra:

भूतिः स्थिरा यत्र नयस्य नाम्ना धीरः श्रुतो यो भुवि कृष्णवीरः ।
सोऽथ द्विजं तं निजराज्यतन्त्रसारथ्यकृत्ये वरयांचकार ॥ 33

In the last verse of the canto, it is said that the king entrusted the burden of administration on his nephew (sister's son) and enjoyed life.

अथ वैषयिकततेः प्रभुरवनेः शुभकृदभूत् पृथगेव स विनिवेषणाहृतधीर्युवनृपताम् ।
मथितागसि निदधेऽपि च महिते स्वसृतनये रथवाजिभिरमितैर्दशरथभूपतिसमनाः ॥ 34

According to the matriarchal system, it is the sister's son who succeeds; not

the son. Here the first canto ends. It would be found that compared to the poems now available, this is a very short canto.

The second canto begins with the mention of the king's consort named Guptastrī, who belonged to the community of actresses (nartakīnām variṣṭhā).

अजनि गिरिशगेहात् तस्य पाश्चात्यभागे त्रिजगदुरुसमज्ञे संज्ञया वत्सतीरे ।
धरणिकमितुरिष्टा नर्तकीनां बरिष्ठा कुटिलदृगथ गुप्तस्त्रीति नाम्ना प्रसिद्धा ॥

Her family name is Vatsatīra, which means cerukkara (*vatsa* means *ceru* and *tīra* means *kara*). Her house was on the western side of the Śiva temple in the city. The pair spent twelve years in full enjoyment, but they were sad that they had no daughter born.

अतिजितमनसोऽपि प्रेयसीसंप्रयोगादनुदिवसमनल्पं सौख्यमाबिभ्रतोऽस्य ।
अतिययुरुरुकीर्तेर्द्वादशाब्दाः कलावत् प्रवरयदुनरेन्द्रस्येन्द्रसान्द्रेन्दिरस्य ॥ 5
न तु विरहदशासीत् क्वापि नेच्छानिषेधो रतिहतिरपि सुप्त्या नान्यकार्योपरोधः ।
तदपि सदृशकन्योत्पत्त्यभावात्तदुच्चैरजनि मिथुनमाधिध्यानमौनानुबद्धम् । 6

In a matriarchal family, it is the birth of a daughter that is wished for; not of a son.

The king became very much affiicted on account of this sorrow, and his minister advised him to worship Śiva in his temple at Kanṭiyūr, when he heard about his master's sorrow:

इत्थं सुमेधसि सुदुर्मनसीन्द्रवर्ये तस्मिन् नृपे स्वभवनं प्रविशन् मनीषी ।
अंभ्यन्तरीपपुरतः सुचिरान्निवृत्तः शुश्राव तत्प्रकृतिसंसदि कृष्णवीरः ॥ 10
सद्यो निवृत्य सचिवैः सह तैर्हितैषी तस्मात् सवत्सलतयापि(प)च वत्सतीरम् ।
तत्सौधगेन विभूना भृशमर्चितश्च तत्सौहृदात् सदसि वाक्यमिदं बभाषे ॥ 11

The advice of the minisetr, in which the greatness and grace of ñiva are described, take up nearly the whole of the second canto (verses 12 to 40). In the last verse it is said that he started his worship.

The worship, which lasted for ninety days, is described in the early portion of the third canto. This has some resemblance to the prayers of the gods in the second canto of the *Kumārasambhava*. Śiva appeared before the king and told him that he was pleased with his devotion and worship. Śiva's part (*aṃśa*) had already been born in the world, and so Pārvatī's part will be born as his daughter:

ममांशः केरलावन्यामस्ति कश्चन मानवः ।
पुरैव विप्रकार्यार्थमवतीर्णः सुपुण्यधीः ॥ 85
मत्कामिनी ततो गौरी त्वत्कन्यात्वमुपेयुषी ।
अचिरेणैव वीरस्य तस्य भार्या भविष्यति ॥86

Consoling the king with these words, Śiva disappeared. He had spent four months in this way; from that time he decided to worship Śiva every day. There are ninety verses in this canto, which ends at this stage.

The pregnancy, the birth of the daughter, the parents' joy, the festivity on the occasion of the birth of the daughter, these things are very beautifully described in the fourth canto. This takes up 44 verses in the canto. Then the king did not know what name he should give to the daughter and this problem was weighing heavily on him; and at that time Śiva again appeared before him during his sleep, in His Ardhanārīśvara form.

अविनिश्चयतः क्रमेण शोचन् विजनेऽशेत विचिन्तयन् मुहूर्तम् ।
विनिमीलितमात्र एव नेत्रे प्रभुरर्धाङ्गनशम्भुराविरासीत् ।। 45

There is a vivid description of Śiva at this stage, as He appeared before him. Then Śiva gave him advice on the matter. I give the whole passage.

परिणीतिविधेरनन्तरं नौ विरहाभावविधित्सया निगूढः ।
प्रकटीकृत एष भाव्यवेषः प्रणतापत्तिहरो विशिष्टदेहः ।। 52
भुवनोद्भ्रमणप्रदे प्रवृत्ते दिवसान्तस्पृशि ताण्डवे प्रवृत्ते ।
मृदुलास्यकृदप्यसौ तदा नो नटनस्याजनि विघ्नकारिणी मे ।। 53
विगतस्खलिता सदैव ताले विविधायां च गतौ भृशानुकूला ।
करणादिषु चाप्यकातराङ्गी निपुण(न)भ्रूनयनादिचेष्टिते च ।। 54
अवधानवती तनोति नृत्तं पुनरद्यापि तदाद्यसौ तथैव ।
अमुतः क्रमशोऽकृशाद्यथा मे प्रियतामेत्यनुवासरं विशेषात् ।।55
मम जीवितवल्लभा कि(त)लेयं दुहिता तद्भविता नरेन्द्रसिंह ।
इयमर्थमभिप्रदर्शयन्त्या भुवने ख्यातगुणाख्यया समस्ते ।।56
अभिधानमिदं यथार्थमुच्चैर्दयितं चात्मगुणप्रशंसयास्याः ।
अत एव ममापि नर्तकीनामुचितं चेदृशमेव नाम लोके ।।57
अविचार्य पुरैव चेदृगेतत् कुलजानां क्रियमाणमस्ति नाम ।
नृप केरलभाषया णकारं नपदे प्राकृतनीतितो नियोज्य ।।58
इह चापि(वि) विधेहि तत्तथैव व्यवधानं कुरु मा क्षणान्तरेण ।
उभयोरपि पश्य नौ नियोगादधिकं मङ्गलमङ्ग किं नु लोके ।। 59
व्यतिरेक्यनया न भावनीयं भवतानेहसि भाविनि स्थितं मे ।
अशरीरतया स्मृतोऽप्यवश्यं न विनेमां जनताशये प्रवर्ते ।। 60

What is conveyed is that the name must be naṭī. The na should be replaced by ṇa and there must be vowels intervening between the letters. Thus naṭī will be u-ṇṇ-i-ā-ṭ-ī. This is quite a common name among the actresses in Malabar. The real meaning of the name was never before thought of when the name was given to others previously.

the mention of the two kinds of Brahmins, one proficient in arms and the other in Śāstras.

समृद्धगीताततवादितातता धृतोरुभूषप्रमदाशतावृता ।
सुहृद्यकास्तुरिकचान्द्रसौरभा विवृद्धसंभूतिविहाससैनिका ॥ 55
प्रभुव्रजोपायनदानसन्ततप्रवृत्तलोकाविरलप्रतोलिका ।
प्रसक्तनादक्रयविक्रयापणा ततः पुरी सा विरराज सर्वदा ॥ 58

The fifth canto ends with this. There are 60 verses here. The following is the concluding verse.

तदागामित्वोद्यत्प्रमदविगताहारशयनस्पृहा सर्वा खर्वेतरनृपशता शैवलपुरी ।
चरन्ती धावन्ती सततमभिगर्जन्त्यत इतो विशन्तो निर्गच्छन्त्यपि च रजनीं तामगमयत् ॥60

The kings had come with their retinue and there was great crowd in the city. The morning of the svayaṃvara day is described in the early portion of the sixth canto, till the 24th verse. Then there is the description of the heroine's preparation to start for the svayaṃvara ceremony. The place was crowded by various sorts of people and the heroine's entry into the special place arranged for the ceremony form the last portion of the sixth canto. There are 66 verses here.

The metre changes very often even in the same canto. In the sixth canto, the metre in the beginning is Vasantatilaka. Then after 60 verses, the metre changes into Praharṣiṇī for five verses and the fifth introduces the name of the metre also.

समृद्धयौवनोदयप्रगल्भपीनकर्कशस्तनद्वयेतरेतरप्रकल्पितोपगूहनाः ।
विदग्धमुद्रया पुनश्चलदृशः समापयन् जगत्रयप्रहर्षिणीममुत्र केलिमुद्यताम् ॥ 65

The next verse is in Mālinī metre. In other cantos the metre changes even in the middle of the canto.

The svayaṃvara forms the theme of the seventh canto. Here one expects a description of the kings assembled on the occasion; but the reader is sorely disappointed. All that is said is that the guide described the various kings, and the heroine did not accept any one of them. There is the description of the behaviour of the kings who had assembled for the wedding.

रूपेण लक्ष्म्या बहु(विभु)लीलया च तस्या जिताश्चाप्यवनीभृतोऽन्ये ।
कर्माणि चक्रुः प्रविलोभनानि रागार्दिता राजवरात्मजायाः ॥ 5
उच्छोटितेनैककरेण भृत्यात् संगृह्य ताम्बूलमथापरेण ।
संताड्य संताड्य सलीलमंसे संभावयामास वयस्यमेकः ॥ 6
निस्त्रिंशमुद्यम्य शुभं सकोशं व(च)मांथ निर्माय च वामबाहुम् ।
आकाशमेकः प्रजहार शत्रुमावार्य तच्छ्रस्त्रधिया यदेव ॥ 10

सूक्तान्यपास्तार्गलमीरितानि गान्धर्विणा कश्चन सेवकेन ।
मूर्धानमाकम्प्य मुहुर्मुहुः स्वमास्वादयत् सस्मितमात्तलीलः ॥ 12
कश्चित् स्वकक्ष्याधृतयोगपट्टः स्पष्टं कराभ्यां विरचय्य तालम् ।
अन्वीक्ष्य वक्षोऽसमनेकशः स्वं कन्यामुदासीनवदभ्यपश्यत ॥ 16
इत्यादि नानाविधचेष्टितौघैः प्रख्यापयत्स्वेषु धृतेर्विधूतिम् ।
विद्या विनीत्या(त्य) परयेव नीत्या धात्र्या कुमारी तमियाय देशम् ॥ 19

This is quite in imitation of the verses in the sixth canto of the *Raghuvaṃśa*. Even the beginning of the description has some resemblance to that portion. The guide narrated the greatnesses of the assembled kings in a very clever way.

तेषां गुणान् कोशबलादिकं वा धात्रीं नृपाणां विनिवेदयन्तीम् ।
कोऽसौ महस्वीति शनैः प्रसन्ना पप्रच्छ कन्यान्यतमं नरेन्द्रम् ॥ 26

Thus the heroine came near a particular suitor and she was eager to know who it was. The guide narrated the details of him and this corresponds to the description of Aja in the sixth canto of the *Raghuvaṃśa*.

अध्यासते केरलभूभृतो यां यस्या यथार्थैव महोदयाख्या ।
रामावनौ मुख्यतमा पुरी या तामावसत्येष दिवं वृषेव ॥ 3
मन्ये स रामोऽप्ययमेव रामवर्माह्वयः क्षत्रमहोनिधानम् ।
आज्ञाकृतामप्यमितत्विषोऽस्य भ्रूक्षेपवश्यैव पुरन्दरश्रीः ॥ 32
निःसीममाहोदयसद्मनोऽस्य दक्षोत्तरोद्देशविसारि तेजः ।
नान्योऽत्र हेतुस्तत एतदीयः ख्यातो बहुव्यापितयान्ववायः ॥ 33

Here the dynasty of the prince is given as bahuvyāpī. Bahu means perum and vyāpī means paṭarpu (paṭappu); thus the dynasty is Perumpaṭappu. The Cochin Royal family is even now known as Perumpaṭappu family.

न्यक्षेण संलक्षितलक्षणौघलक्ष्यः क्षमी रक्षितसंश्रितश्रीः ।
लक्ष्म्याः सुतः पश्य स रामवर्मा लक्ष्मीवतोऽमुष्य तु भागिनेयः ॥ 36
अज्ञानवृक्षाशनिसन्निपातः प्रख्यातवल्लीमणिकल्पशाखी ।
कस्यैष पश्यादरभूर्न लोके शास्त्रोपजीविव्रजचक्रवर्ती ॥ 51
आयुष्मतोऽप्यस्य तवापि वत्से दूरस्थितिर्नाभिमता ममेयम् ।
हैमस्य वा चारुविभूषणस्य माणिक्यमुख्यस्य च कः समोऽन्यः ॥ 56
सुतनु किल रसोऽसौ पश्य शृङ्गारनामा मिथुनमपि लघीयस्संश्रयन्नग्र्य एव ।
भुवनतिलकयोर्वां सङ्गमादङ्गजार्द्राद्भवतु स रसचक्रे साम्प्रतं सार्वभौमः ॥ 60

The heroine's shyness, the guide suggesting that they might proceed, the discomfiture of the heroine and the way the guide assisted her in chosing that youth, these descriptions closely follow the corresponding part of the *Raghuvaṃśa*. There is also the anger of the disappointed kings. The whole canto has 84 verses.

In the eighth canto the theme is the honey-moon of the married couple. This is a good imitation of the eighth canto of the *Kumārasambhava*. I can only quote a few verses as samples.

पाणिपीडनविधिं विधिनाथो भूपतिः परिसमाप्य मृगाक्ष्याः ।
तामुपेत्य यतते स्म नवोढां केलये कलितकैतवहासः ॥ 1
शीर्षरोगमभिनीय शयानः कोविदास्वपसृतासु सखीषु ।
बाष्पवत्स्ववदनानतमस्याः सम्ममार्ज स करेण मुखाब्जम् 12
सख्यसन्निधिषु तां स्मरतुन्नां नित्यमेव विविधैः समुपायैः ।
इत्यसावरमयद्विरहेषु स्वल्पकेष्वपि सुदुस्तरतापाम् ॥ 14

This is followed by the description of the advent of the rainy season in thirteen verses from 16 to 28. The rest of the canto is taken up by the description of their enjoyment during the season.

तदनु सपदि वर्षास्वस्य तस्यां रिरंसां प्रसभमजडयन्त्यो रोदसोराविरासन् ।
जलदकुसुमजालैः कामिनः कामबाणैः स्वगृहकुहरबाह्यान् कातरान् कारयन्त्यः ॥ 16
मधुकरकुलभङ्काराख्यशङ्खोरुघोषैस्त्रिभुवननरनारीस्त्रासयन् विग्रहैषी ।
पटुतरजवपौरस्त्याशुगांश्वाधिरूढो मदनभट उदस्थाद्धूतविद्युल्लतासिः ॥ 25
नरपतिकुलनाथः सोऽप्यथावश्यकं स्वं नियममुपसमाप्य प्रीणितोतस्त्रष्टपूज्यः ।
कतिपयपरिवारो याति पूर्वाह्णकाले दयितजननिषेव्यं वेश्म भव्यं विवेश ॥ 29

After a few months of stay, there, the couple went to the residence of the husband and here the poem ends. There are 56 verses in this canto.

The king of Kāyaṅkulam, the heroine's father, is mentioned as a Yādava king. There are various places where he is so designated. I give a few.

सदसि यदुनरेन्द्रं तं समाश्वासयित्वा । III-88
मुहुः प्रदध्यौ यदुवीरनायकः । V-34
यदुनरपतिकेतोरिष्टलब्ध्यै यियासोः । VI-66
तं राजसिंहं यदुराजपुत्र्यै । VII-28
यूयं यूयं च नान्ये वयमपि सुभटा यादवेन्द्रप्रियार्थम्
....
एकैकस्यैष देशस्त्वित यदुसचिवा वारयामासुरेतान् । VII-73

About the date of the poem, all that we can say is that if the poem describes contemporary events, then it must be about the fourteenth century, since the Cochin Royal family had its residence at Tiruvañcikkulam about this time. Later they moved over to another place. If the poet had given some more information in the poem by describing the assembled kings, that would have been of great historical value.

There is a Malayālam work in the Campū form, describing the same story. There the story is narrated in quite a different form. There is only a fragment found out. I have seen only a description of the fragment. But that fragment does not seem to be of any help in deciding the date of this work.

In a Malayalam work called the *Uṇṇunīlī-Sandeśa* which belongs to the fourteenth century, there is a mention of the heroine as a contemporary personality. This also supports the assumption that the work belongs to about the fourteenth century.

In one place, the king of Kāyaṅkulam is described as a Sāmanta.

सामन्तमौलिदुहितुः सुतरां चकाशे । VI.27

If this suggests that he was a Sāmanta or feudatory of the Perumpaṭappu kings, (the modern Cochin Maharajas), then that information is of some historical value.

The Perumpaṭappu Royal family is designated as Keralādhīśvaras in some places:-

उत्तीर्य नामथ विश पुरीं केरलाधीश्वराणाम् । (Mayūrasandeśa I-90).

Although there are no historical details given, yet the poem has great historical value, apart from its poetic merits.

C. KUNHAN RAJA

Akbar's Philosophy of Life

The religious system of Akbar, called by him *Tauhid-i-Ilahi* or Divine Monotheism was the personal philosophy of life that he evolved out of the rationalization and the analytic discussions of the court. It was "a faith based on some elementary principles" which "traced itself in the mirror of his heart."[1] This has found only partial expression in the *Din-i-Ilahi,* as we know it from the contemporary historians. There has been a good deal of confused thinking regarding the Divine Faith. V. A. Smith sums it up in the following words:—"The organization of the adherents of the Din-i-Ilahi was that of an order rather than of a church. The creed so far as there was one, inculcated monotheism with a tinge of pantheism; the practical deification of the Emperor as the vice-gerent of God filled with special grace; and the adoration of the Sun, with subsidiary veneration of fire and artificial lights." Students of history have often vaguely mixed up in their minds the personal religion and religious practices of Akbar about which we have comparatively fuller information, from the *Din i Ilahi* which presents a tantalisingly blurred picture altogether. The material available for the latter is scrappy and it bristles with problems and difficulties. While it is evident that Akbar's Divine Faith would surely have reflected his own personal views and practices, it will be wrong to assume that all his views were actually incorporated into the Faith or that all the members thereof emulated his example in every respect.

As the name *Tauhid i-Ilahi* indicates, Akbar was a confirmed monotheist. "There is no God but God" remained his motto. He did not attempt to form a cut-and-dried conception of Him by a process of pure rationalization. To him God could be known by other senses than the physical, nor can He be understood or expressed through physical media. Being formless, He can be contacted only by imagination[2]:—"That which is without form cannot be seen whether in sleeping or waking but it is apprehensible by force of imagination." It follows that a person will conceive of

1 Badaoni (Blochmann, *Ain-i-Akbari,* I, p. 179; Lowe translates:—"Thus a faith of a materialistic character became painted on the storehouse of his imagination (pp. 263-4).

2 Perhaps corresponding to 'Love' of the Sufis, 'Bhakti' of the Vedantists and the 'Intuition' of the Theosophists.

Him according to his capacity, according to his intelligence and limitations. Thus "each person according to his condition gives the Supreme Being a name, but in reality to name the Unknowable is in vain." Nor is it necessary to define or name him since "the object of an appellative is the removal of ambiguity, but this is not predicable of the All Holy Essence." His attitude was however not that of the Hīnayāna Buddhist or the Agnostic who ignored God without denying His existence.

He conceived of God as a Force, a Power, an essence as well as a Personal Being. Like the Iranian Sufi and the Indian Vedāntist he thought of Him as a Being apart from the world and yet is one with it in so far as it is only His manifestation. The individual is a part of Him and a spark of His flame.

That Akbar till the end of his life also conceived of God as a person, there is no doubt. Unless he vested Him with the attributes of personality, he would not have been so devout in offering prayers and vows. On various occasions he offered prayers for the dead, appealing to the Almighty for pardon.

This two-fold conception of God was probably the one which was accepted by Akbar though his sayings are expressive of a dislike to probe intellectually and define the Supreme Being. Intellectually ignoring Him, he was ever arduous in his attempts to sense the Divine mystically.

God is omnipresent, and was beyond discussion, even as "a vacuum in nature is impossible." The Divine Being emanates harmony and good, and the disharmony and evil in this world is the result of human action and reaction. He has no use for the conception of a Satan, as "to impute the existence of evil to Satan is to make him a co-partner of the Almighty. If he is a robber, who is responsible for his being one?"

Regarding the nature of relationship between God and man, the Creator and the creature, his idea is very similar to the Sufis, according to whom, the striving of the creature who is imperfect towards the Creator who is perfect is termed love. It is the relationship which exists between the creatures of the Universe and the one Supreme Being, the most perfect, the most good. In his own words:

"There exists a bond between the Creator and the creature which is not expressible in language.

Each thing has a quality inseparable from it and the heart is influenced by some irresistable attachments to the power of which it submits and builds

thereon the foundation of its sorrows and joys. Whosoever by his brilliant destiny withdraws his affections from all worldly concerns attains to the Divine Love which is above all others.

Whosoever habituates himself to preserve this sacred relation will be held from it by no other occupation. When this interior affection both in its immaterial and material aspects is thus strengthened, who can sever the attachment of the rational soul to the Supreme Being."

Though Akbar was by no means an atheist or an out and out rationalist, still he set great store by reason, which jewel every one on the path of the spirit should keep pure and burnished. "A man is the disciple of his own reason. If it has naturally a good lustre, it becomes itself his director and if it gains under the direction of a higher mind, it is still a guide." He was against being imposed upon by authority in all spiritual matters, be it the authority of a teacher, tradition or a religious book. "Commanding obedience to the dictates of reason and reproving a slavish following of others need the aid of no arguments. If imitation were commendable, the Prophets would have followed their predecessors." Authority is a stumbling block to the preservation of the purity of the mind and hence is an obstacle on the spiritual path.

Spiritual life for Akbar is not one of theological speculation but an active life of good works. Knowledge gained from books which does not project itself forth into good works "is worse than ignorance." True spiritual life would be to avoid the extremes of asceticism and indulgence in worldly pleasures. Perhaps this idea of balance between a life of austerity and renunciation and of callous indulgence is what he meant to express in his simile: "Hindu women fetch water from their rivers, tanks or wells, and many of them bear several pitchers one above the other and upon their heads and converse and chat freely with their companions walking the while over any inequalities of ground. If the heart in like manner preserves the balance of its pitchers, no harm will befall them. Why should men be inferior to these in their relation with the Almighty?" Again "from the practice of real asceticism the transition is easy to unlawful mendicancy. Since a thing is best comprehended by contrast with its opposite, the latter also thus comes to be pleasurably regarded." So in order to escape from a certain condition of life, it would be unwise and useless to rush to the opposite. The wise man is he who will not shift from one extreme to the other but keep the balance between the two.

The traditional Muslim ideas of preordained justice, of punishment in Hell or reward in Heaven was rejected by Akbar. He came to believe in the transmigration of souls and in the idea of gradual evolution from lower forms of life to higher ones. "Rewards and punishments of a kind which cannot be comprehended by the mind of man, there certainly is, as a result of which the whole process of evolution progresses." But he discarded the Qoranic ideas of Heaven and Hell and Pre-ordination, Resurrection and Judgment as his mental reasoning revolted against them. "The severe illness of the young suggests the doctrine of metempsychosis. What the divine books say that great sinners in ancient times were changed into monkeys and boars is credible. If the idea were merely that souls were transfused into a few determinate shapes, this would be unworthy; but if the strange workings of destiny joined them to mineral, vegetable and animal life in serial progression till they were exalted to a high dignity where would be the wonder?'"

"Some of the ancients say that the punishment of each continues through various bodies......This prepared for the expiation of each period—this corroborates the above."

He again rejected the ancient idea that God sends trials to his creations and the rigour of the trial is greatest for those whom he loves most and diminishes in degree from the Prophets and the saints down to the virtuous and the ordinary mortals. The idea was incredible that the elect of God could be punished and if it was a trial sent by God why should He "who knows both what is hidden and what is manifest" have recourse to trials?

His conception of a soul was perhaps similar to Abul Fazl's who after long deliberation became convinced that the rational soul is subtle divine essence, separate from the body, having however a peculiar union with this elemental form."

The goal of man was to perfect his mind and heart and to gain repose and happiness from the problems of life which are the result of shortsightedness and egotism. "Men through blindness do not observe what is around them, intent only on their own advantage." Thus full rein is given to anger and desire which are the outcome of egotism. It is only by a constant alertness that the mind can be freed from its shortsightedness and when the mind is free, knowledge and wisdom dawn and there is an end of misery. "The source of misery is self-aggrandisement and unlawful desires.'"

Apart from an active good life, prayers, rituals and meditations have a place in Akbar's scheme of spiritual life. These are of an eclectic nature and have been either adopted from other religions or formulated by himself. Akbar was a devout, conforming Muslim till about 1579. He frequented many a saint's shrine, especially that of Sh. Moinuddin Chishti at Ajmere. He prayed for a son and when he got one, he devoutly gave thanksgiving and fulfilled his previous vows. Thus he often prayed for temporal blessings though he strongly disapproved "of asking temporal blessings in which the humiliation of another was involved."

But about the year 1574, when there was a failure of rain the cultivators and the general public requested him to intercede by prayer to God for the grant of the blessing of rain, Akbar said "Asking and praying belong to the external world. The Beneficent Creator knows everything and it is written on the tablet of fate before a wish is expressed. Apparently the reason why saints have had recourse to prayer is that those who slumber in the dark night of ignorance may be awakened to enter on the path of submission which is the adornment of worship, and the material of bliss. The Divine goodness towards his servants is greater than that His mercy should depend on our appeals to him or upon our calling his attention to the matter or that we should teach him graciousness."

In 1579 when Akbar discontinued visiting the shrine of Moinuddin Chishti, Abul Fazl explains that he had come to believe of late "that the visiting of tombs of departed men of awakened heart, he considers as an instance of shallowness. If union with the spirit of the Saint be the object, then nearness or remoteness does not matter. If the idea be to reverence worn out dust, then it is polytheism and idolatry. At this time......the idea of this kind of worship (visiting shrines etc.) became erased from the mind" (of Akbar).

In so far as Akbar conformed to ceremonial worship, his favourite form of such worship was that of the Sun and the Fire. He says "As people think that the neglect of some sort of worship abominable, there can be nothing improper in the veneration of that exalted element which is the source of man's existence and of the duration of his life."

Adoration of the Sun was an important feature of Vedic Hinduism. The Gāyatrī is a praise of the Sun and the hymn is repeated by every Brahmin at his morning and evening devotions:—"Of the God-like Sun this surpassing radiance we contemplate excites to action our intelligence."

Similarly Fire worship is also a part of the Hindu Dharma. The Homa sacrifice is only an adoration of the fire. This is done by a Brahmin both in the morning and evening. Akbar's veneration of the Sun and the Fire might have been derived from both Hinduism and Zoroastrianism.

Akbar thus had outgrown anthropomorphic deities and was left face to face with Nature during the last stage of his life. Perhaps his idea of worship would be described by the following passage:—"There is only one kind of prayer which is reasonable, and that is the deep silent adoration of the greatness and beauty and order around us, as revealed in the realms of non-rational life and in humanity as we bow our heads before the laws of the Universe and mould our lives into obedience to their voice, we find a strong, calm peace steal over our hearts, a perfect trust in the ultimate triumph of the right, a quiet determination to make our lives sublime"...... "the contemplation of the ideal is true prayer, it inspires, it strengthens, it ennobles. The other part of prayer is work."[3]

Abul Fazl says of Akbar: "The great object of his life is the acquisition of that sound morality, the sublime loftiness of which captivates the hearts of thinking sages......" Again, "he passed every moment of his life in self-examination or in adoration of God" which was one and the same thing to him.

What was then Akbar's position from the standpoint of outward religion? If a label must be given to him, it may be very near correct to describe him as a *Theosophist*. Like the latter he did not give up his own religion but saw the need of a comparative study of religions and to synthesize them in such a manner as to create a faith and a philosophy to suit his needs. Akbar picked and chose intelligently and refused what seemed unacceptable or unessential. Hence his creed was simple but gave him a tentative, fairly satisfactory philosophy of life.

Akbar's original genius is nowhere more nobly expressed than in the department of religion and philosophy. If there was no other achievement to his credit, still, on the basis of his intelligent and earnest attempt to unravel the eternal mystery of life, posterity would be compelled to reckon him as one of the greatest personalities of Indian history.

R. KRISHNAMURTI

3 The Nature and Existence of God by Dr. Besant quoted in her Autobiography.

MISCELLANY

A Note on the Coin of Rudravarma

The unique silver coin of King Rudravarma in the Punjab Museum collection[1] has hitherto been attributed to the Audumbara tribe.[2] Cunningham and Whitehead included it among the coins of the 'Odumbaras.'[3] Mr. Allan also held the same opinion.[4]

The coin in question has on the obverse "humped Indian bull" to right, "lotus flower" in front, and marginal legend in Kharoṣṭhī. On its reverse we find "elephant with upraised trunk" to right, "trident battle-axe of Śiva" in front, and marginal legend in Brāhmī. Cunningham read the marginal legend in Kharoṣṭhī as "Rājña Vamakisa Rudravarmasa vijayata," and the one in Brāhmī as "Rājna Vamakisa Rudravarmasa vijaya." Mr. Whitehead read the obverse legend in Kharoṣṭhī as "Rajña Vamakisa Rudravarmasa vijayata", the reverse legend in Brāhmī was, in his view, the same as the obverse legend. Mr. Bergny, however, had pointed out that the word which precedes the king's name in the marginal legend is 'Vemakisa,' and not 'Vamakisa,' and that the coin is one "of king Vemaki Rudravarma, the Conqueror."[5] Prof. Rapson accepted Mr. Bergny's reading of "Vemaki," standing for "Vaimaki," as correct, and observed that in legends on ancient Indian coins 'guṇa' often occurs where we should expect 'vṛddhi,' as for example, 'Odumbari' for 'Audumbari,' meaning the king of the Udumbaras.[6] In his *Catalogue of Ancient Indian Coins in the British Museum* Mr. Allan read the obverse legend in Kharoṣṭhī as "Raña Vamakisa Rudravarmasa vijayata," and the reverse legend in Brāhmī as "Rajña Vamakisa Rudravarmasa vajaya[ka?]."[7] Elsewhere in the same *Catalogue* he proposed certain changes in his original reading of the marginal legends in Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī, which he now reads respectively as "Vijayaya-raña

1 Whitehead, *CCPM.*, I, p. 167, no. 137; and pl. xvi.

2 But R. D. Banerjee says that "the attribution of coins, which do not bear the name of the tribe, to the Audumbaras must be very doubtful'.' (*J.A.S.B.*, 1914, *Num. Suppl.*, xxiii, p. 248).

3 Cunningham, *CAI.*, pp. 66-68; and pl. iv, fig. 6.

4 Allan, *CCAIBM.*, Introd., pp. lxxxv-vi; also p. 125, no. 23; and pl. xiv, no. 13.

5 Bergny, *J.R.A.S.*, 1900, p. 419.

6 Rapson, *J.R.A.S.*, 1900, p. 429, fn. 2

7 Allan, *CCAIBM.*, p. 125.

Vemakisa Rudravarmasa" and "Vijayaka-rajñ[o] Vemakisa Rudravarmasa," meaning "Of the victorious king Rudravarman the Vimaki."[8]

A careful examination of the coin-plates leaves little room for doubt that 'Vemaki' is the correct reading of the word preceding the king's name. On the analogy of 'Odumbari,' meaning a ruler of the 'Odumbara' tribe, we may reasonably take Vemaki to mean a ruler of the Vemaka tribe. King Rudravarma would, thus, appear to have been a ruler of the Vemaka tribe, and not of the Audumbaras as was generally supposed by scholars. The tribal name in Prakrit should be taken to have been Vemaka, and not Vimaka, as was done by Mr. Bergny and Prof. Rapson. Taking 'Vimaka' as the name of the tribe, Prof. Rapson observed that "a people of this name seems not to be known from any other source." It is interesting to note, however, that the *Mahābhārata* mentions a tribe called Vaiyāmaka along with the Darvas, the Audumbaras, the Kāśmīras, the Trigarttas, and other North Indian tribes. The passage of the *Mahābhārata*,[9] which mentions these tribes, runs as follows:

"कैराता-दरदा-दर्वाः शूरा-**वैयामका**स्तथा । औदुम्बरा-दूर्विभागाः पारदा-वाह्लिकैः सह ॥
काश्मीराश्च कुमाराश्च घोरका-हंसकायनाः । शिवि-त्रिगर्त्त-यौधेया-राजन्या-मद्र-कैकयाः ॥
अम्वष्ठाः कौकुरास्तार्क्ष्या-वस्त्रपाः पह्लवैः सह । वशातयाश्च मौलेयाः सह क्षुद्रक-मालवैः ॥
पौण्ड्रिकाः कुक्कुराश्चैव शकाश्चैव विशाम्पते । अङ्गा-वङ्गाश्च पुण्ड्राश्च शाणवत्या-गयास्तथा ॥"

In the passage, quoted above, we find an enumeration of the various tribes that brought tributes to Yudhiṣṭhira. Among the tribes mentioned there is one called Vaiyāmaka whom we would like to identify with 'Vemaka', which probably is the Prakrit form of Vaiyāmaka. It will be seen that in the passage of the *Mahābhārata*, quoted above, the Vaiyāmakas are mentioned along with the Audumbaras and other tribes of the Himalayan region like the Darvas, the Kāśmīras and the Trigarttas.[10] This fact would suggest that they were neighbouring tribes, and that the Vaiyāmakas are to be located in a territory adjacent to that of the Darvas, the Kāśmīras, the Trigarttas and the Audumbaras, in the foothills of the Hima-

8 Allan, *CCAIBM.*, pp. lxxxv-vi.

9 *Mbh(Bang. Ed.), Sabhāparvan,* ch. 52, ll. 13-16; also S. Sörensen, *Index to Names in the Mahābhārata,* II, p. 705, for 'Vaiyamaka.'

10 The Audumbaras are located in the Kangra and Hoshiarpur districts of the Punjab; the Darvas gave their name to Dārvābhisāra, corresponding to the Punch and Naoshera districts of Kashmir; the Kāśmīras are the people of Kashmir in the western Himalayas; the Trigarttas are located in the Jullunder Doab.

layas. The association of the Vaiyāmakas with the Audumbaras is of particular interest, because the evidence of coin-finds as also of coin-types shows that the Vemakas, whom we have identified with the Vaiyāmakas of the *Mahābhārata*, lived in the close neighbourhood of the Audumbaras. The Vemaka coin of king Rudravarma in the Lahore Museum, wrongly described by Cunningham as a silver hemi-drachm of the Audumbaras, "was found in a field near Jwālamukhi in company with 3 silver pieces of the Kunindas, and 28 Philopator hemi-drachms of Apollodotus." This fact would suggest that the Kangra district was the habitat of the Vemakas. Cunningham's silver coin of the Audumbaras "was found in the Pathankot district," and his 7 copper coins of the same tribe "were all found in Pathankot itself." According to V. A. Smith, Audumbara coins are found mainly in the Kangra and Hoshiarpur districts of the Punjab.[11] We have seen that the Vemaka coin of King Rudravarma also came from the Kangra district. The two tribes, the Vemakas and the Audumbaras, would thus appear to have inhabited the same or more probably adjacent regions in the Eastern Punjab. The evidence of coin-provenances is further supported by that of coin-types. Mr. Allan has already noticed the close resemblance between the types of Rudravarma the Vemaki and those of Mahādeva of the Audumbara series. This close resemblance of types would suggest proximity of mints and of districts of circulation, for, as Rapson has already pointed out, Indian coin-types are predominantly local in character.[12]

It will be interesting to note in this connexion that Bhaṭṭa Utpala, the noted commentator on the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* of Varāhamihira, mentions, on the authority of Parāśara, a tribe named Vaimaka in the north-eastern division of India, along with the Kāśmīras, the Daradas, the Darvābhimuras (apparently a mistake for Darvābhisāras), and others.[13] There can be little doubt that

11 Smith, *CCIM.*, I, p. 160. 12 Rapson, *CICBM.*, p. xi.

13 *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* (Dvivedi's ed.), Pt. I, pp. 293-94. The quotation from Parāśara runs as follows:

"अथ प्रागुत्तरस्यां कौलूत-ब्रह्मपुर-कुणिन्द-दिवादिन-पारत-नष्टराज्य-वनराष्ट्र-**वैमकै**-नभल्ल-सिंहपुर-चामर-तङ्गण-सार्यक-पर्वतक-काश्मीर-दरद-दर्वाभिमुर-जटासुर-पटोल-सैरिन्ध्र-कुचिन्तन-किरात-पशुपाल-चीन-सुवर्णभूमि-देवस्थल-देवोद्यानानि ।"

Parāśara, who is here quoted by Bhaṭṭa Utpala, is undoubtedly earlier than Varāhamihira who mentions Vaśiṣṭha and Nagnajit as early authorities, passages from whom are frequently quoted by Utpala. The author is indebted for this reference

the Vaimakas of the *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* are the same people who are mentioned as Vaiyāmakas in the *Mahābhārata* and as Vemakas in coin-legends. The tribe appears to have been a minor one. Its coinage was slight. We can definitely ascribe to this Kṣatriya tribe the silver coin of King Rudravarma.[14]

RABIS CHANDRA KAR

and the quotation with the note on the antiquity of Parāśara to Dr. J. N. Banerjea, of the Calcutta University.

14 But there is a square copper coin in the Indian Museum collection which may also belong to the Vemakas (Allan, *CCAIBM.*, Introd., p. cliv & fn. 2; also p. 280, no. 9; and pl. xlv, no. 14). The coin in question has elephant and bull as obverse and reverse types respectively. Mr. Rodgers considered it to be a coin of Hermaeus, but the attribution to Hermaeus becomes highly improbable on account of the non-appearance of the bust of the king. Mr. Allan, moreover, seems to read the obverse legend in Brāhmī as 'Rāja V[a]mak[a] [-]napapasa'. The reading 'Rāja', as Mr. Allan himself admits, is very doubtful, the akṣaras being nothing but the traces of a 'nandipada'. But 'Vamaka' can certainly be read on the plate published by Mr. Allan. 'Vamaka' or 'Vemaka', if that is the reading, provides, as Mr. Allan says, along with the 'elephant and bull' types, "a link with Rudravarman and the Audumbaras." But we have already seen that Rudravarman was a king of the Vemakas, and not of the Audumbaras. The coin may, therefore, be regarded as another specimen of the all too rare coinage of the Vemakas. The attribution to the Vemakas is also supported by the provenance of the coin which "came from the Punjab, probably from the Hoshiarpur district", that is, from about the same locality as the silver coin of the Vemaka chief Rudravarma. The legend on the Indian Museum specimen, however, does not appear to mention the name of any king and one feels tempted to correct Mr. Allan's reading of 'V[a] mak[a] [-] napapasa' as 'Vemaka janapadasa'.

Tibetan Translation of Prakriyā-Kaumudī and the Mention of Siddhānta-Kaumudī therein

It is stated in Cordier's *Catalogue du fonds Tibétain* that there is a Tibetan translation of the grammar of Pāṇini, *Pāṇinivyākaraṇasūtra;* Tanjour, mdo. bo, 1-32a, 2. This reference led me to an investigation of the translated work, and I was surprised to find that the *Siddhāntakaumudī* of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita is mentioned there. It is generally believed that the Sanskrit works contained in the Tibetan Tripiṭaka, had been translated from the seventh to the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D. But the present work shows that as late as the middle of the seventeenth century A.D., such a translation was made in Tibet, the date of Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita being about 1630 A.D.

At the end of the work, there is a description of how, where and by whom this work was translated. It is as follows:—

རང་ཅག་བསོལ་ ལྡན་པ་ རྣམས་ཀྱི་ མཚུངས་པ་མེད་པའི་སྐྱབས་དང་ མགོན་དང་ དཔུང་གཉེན་ དམ་པ་ འཕགས་པ་ ཕྱག་ན་ པདྨ་གསུམ་ ལྡན་ རྡོ་རྗེ་ འཛིན་པའི་ སྐར་བཞེངས་པ་རྒྱལ་བའི་ དབང་པོ་ ཐམས་ ཅད་ མཁྱེན་ པ་ཆེན་པོས་མཐུན་པའི་ཡོ་བྱད་ཐམས་ཅད་འབད་མེད་དུ་ སྩལ་ཏེ་། འདི་ ལྷར་སྒྱུར་ཅིག་ཅེས་བཀའ་ གནང་བ་ཐོབ་པར་བརྟེན། འཕགས་ ཡུལ་ནུབ་ ཕྱོགས་ ཀ་རུ་ཀ་ཥར་ བྲམ་ཟེའི་ རིགས་ ལས་ འཁྲུངས་ པ་མ་ནྡ་པ་ཏྲི་ད བ་ལ་བྷ་དྲ་དང་། སྐྱབས་མཆོག་རྒྱལ་དབང་ཆེན་པོའི་ མཉམ་པ་མེད་པའི བཀའ་དྲིན་ལས། བརྡ་སྤྲོད་པའི་ རིང་ལུགས་ལ་ ཕྱུང་ཟད་ཙམ་སྦྱངས་པ་ ཡོད་ཀྱི་ ལོ་ཙ་བ་ དར་པ་ངག་དབང་ཕུན་ཚོགས་ ལྷུན་གྲུབ་ཀྱིས། བོད་ཡུལ་ དབུས་ཀྱི་ཞིབ་ ཆོས་གྲྭ་ཆེན་པོ་ དཔལ་ ལྡན་ འབྲས་སྤུངས་སུ་ སློབ་དཔོན་ ཆེན་པོ་ རཱ་མ་ཙ་ནྡྲས་ མཛད་པའི་ འགྲེལ་ པར་བརྟེན་ ནས༔ བསྒྱུར་བའོ༎

........................འཕགས་ ཡུལ་པཎ་ཆེན་ གསུང་ ངག་ ཡིད་བཞིན་ དབང་། བརྡ་སྤྲོད་ཀུན་གྱི་ ཕྱི་མ་ པཱ་ཎི་ནི། དཀའ་འགྲེལ་ཟླ་

བའི་ འགྲེལ་པ་ལ་བརྟེན་ནས། སེ་ དཀར་ རིགས་ སྐྱེས་ སྐད་གཉིས་ སྨྲ་བ་ ཡིས་ གཞུང་ ལུགས་ པད་ཚལ་ བཞད་པའི་ གཉེན་དུ་ བསྒྱུར།

It may be translated into Sanskrit thus:—

अस्माकं [1]हैमवतानामनुपमशरणं. नाथश्च परमपरायण आर्यपद्मपाणिस्त्विसम्पन्नो वज्रधरावतारो महासर्वज्ञो जिनेन्द्रः सर्वमनुकूलम् (वस्तुजातम्) अनायासमादिश्य (अवोचत्) एवं परिवर्त्यतामिति । (एताम्) अनुज्ञां लब्ध्वा आर्यतवेशस्य पश्चिमभागे कुरुक्षेत्रे ब्राह्मण-कुलोत्पन्नस्य महापण्डितस्य बलभद्रस्य परमशरणस्याद्वितीयस्य महाजिनेन्द्रस्य च प्रसादाद्-व्याकरणनय ईषन्निष्णातेन युवलोचवेन (लोचव इति संस्कृतज्ञो भौटः) वागीश्वरलक्ष्मी-निराभोगेन भोटदेशमध्यस्थिते श्रीधान्य-कूटके महाधर्मसंघविहारे महाचार्यरामचन्द्रकृतां वृत्तिमाश्रित्य परिवर्तितम् ।

आर्यदेशपण्डितानां प्रवचनाभिप्रायानुसारेण सर्वव्याकरणानामुत्तमः पाणिनिः (पाणिनि-रिति पाणिनिव्याकरणम्) रामचन्द्रस्य वृत्तिमाश्रित्य सेकरकुलोत्पन्नेन भाषाद्वय-भाषिणा शास्त्रकमलवनहंसबान्धवो (भोटभाषायां) रूपान्तरितः ।

To summarize the whole passage:—

The Pope-King of Tibet sent a scholar named ངག་ དབང་ ཕུན་ཚོགས་ ལྷུན་གྲུབ to India, who learnt the grammar of Pāṇini from a Brahmin of Kurukṣetra named Balabhadra. Coming back to Tibet, the scholar translated it into Tibetan with the help of the commentary *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* of Rāmacandra. This scholar was born in a tribe called *se.dkar.*, and this translation was accomplished in the monastic university of Depung འབྲས་སྤུངས།[2]

1 The Haimavatas belong to a local school (which was founded in the first century B.C.) of the *Sthaviras*. They are called the Haimavatas because they live in the mount Himavat. The fundamental doctrines of the Haimavatas, are that a Bodhisattva is not an ordinary mortal, that even a Tirthika has the five *abhijñānas;* that the *pudgala* is separate from the *skandhas;* because in the state of *nirvāṇa* in which the *skandhas* are arrested, the *pudgala* exists. Words enter into *samāpatti* (i.e., words are spoken in that state); suffering is removed by the *mārga*. Vide W. W. Rockhill, *The Life of Buddha,* London, 1884; p. 190.

2 Depung, the most populous and powerful monastery of Tibet was founded by *Jam. cyang. cho. je* (འཇམས་ དབྱངས་ ཆོས་ རྗེ།) in 1415 A.D. It is the largest monastery of the world still existing and is situated at the foot of the hills, in the

This Pope-King whose name is mentioned here as Jinendra,[3] was the fifth Dalai Lama of Tibet. He was born in 1615 A.D., anr became the Master of Tibet in about 1640 A.D. He retired in 1676.

So we see that between the years 1640 and 1676 A.D., the Tibetan scholar was sent to India to learn the Sanskrit grammar, in order to translate it into Tibetan. In this Tibetan volume Mdo bo, there are two translations, the first is called the *Pāṇinivyākaraṇasūtra,* where the original sūtras of Pāṇini are found in an abridged form, according to the arrangement of the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* of Rāmacandra. The second is its commentary the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī*. This was also translated in Depung, by the same Tibetan scholar, after he had learnt the sūtras systematically, with meanings and examples, from the Paṇḍits Balabhadra and Gokulanātha Miśra (who

province of U, three miles off from Lhasa. It was built and named after the great Indian Tantrik monastery *Śridhānyakūṭaka* and is identified with the *Kālacakra* doctrine. It is a big establishment, sufficient to accommodate nearly ten thousand monks. It stands with its numerous clustered buildings, like a small town with streets and lanes. It is divided mainly into four sections, in the middle of which there is a big cathedral that can accommodate all the inmates of the monastery.

Students from different countries, such as China, Mongolia, Siberia, Bhot, Sikkim, Nepal etc. come to study here Buddhism. They put up in different wards meant for different nationalities. The monastery has landed properties given by the Government, and besides that, the donations that it often receives from the public, as well as from the government, are quite sufficient for its requirements. There are several diplomas to be bestowed upon the students. For some, one has to study for four to seven years, for others, twelve to twenty years. The student with the highest diploma is considered a very great scholar and may be chosen as the head of any such monastery in Tibet. Examination for the Highest diploma is held in ཇོ་ཁང་ the famous Buddhist temple of Lhasa, before a common board of examiners from Depung, Se. ra. (a monastery of the similar type where 5500 monks reside), Gahdan (a monastery of the similar type where 3300 monks reside) and such other monasteries.

3 Jinendra རྒྱལ་ དབང་ He was known as:—ངག་ དབང་ བློ་ བཟང་རྒྱ་མཚོ (*Vāgīśvara-sumatisāgara*). For details, see the following books:—A Csoma de Körös, *Grammar of the Tibetan Language,* Calcutta, 1834, pp. 190-192, 198. L. A. Waddel, *Lhasa and its mysteries,* London, 1929, pp. 28-32; *Lamaism and Buddhism in Tibet,* London, 1930, pp. 39-40, 229. Ekai Kawaguchi, *Three years in Tibet,* Adyar, 1909, pp. 417-18. S. C. Das, *Journey to Lhasa and Central Tibet,* London, 1902, pp. 169, 172. Li Ung Bing, *Outline of Chinese history,* Shanghai, 1914, pp. 391-96. Demetrius Charles Boulger, *A short history of China,* London, 1900, pp. 130, 147.

are described as well-versed in five kinds of knowledge), at the command of the above-mentioned Pope-King.

In the description found in the colophon of *Pāṇinivyākaraṇasūtra*, the time when it was translated is not mentioned. In the following volume, Mdo.mo, (the continuation of Mdo.bo.,) the year when the translation was undertaken, as well as when it was accomplished, and the age of the translator also are mentioned. In *Āṣāḍḍha* (July) of ས་མོ་ཕྱི་ year, in the 631st year from the demise of མི་ མཁའ་ རྒྱ་མཚོ་ (which occurred in 1024 A.D.) that is in 1655 A.D., he began the translation at the age of 25. He delivered it to the Depung monastery in *Caitra* (March-April) of *lcags byi.* year that is, in the 22nd month from the date when he undertook the work.[4]

The translator has mentioned the names of four commentaries on Pāṇini; 1. *Mahābhāṣya* 2. *Kāśikā* 3. *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* 4. *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*. He has also given a list of Sanskrit grammars; they are as follows:—

1 *Devarājakṛta Indra-Vyākaraṇa*

2 *Devasuta-candrakṛta Candra-Vyākaraṇa*

3 *Ācāryapiśalikṛtą Piśali-Vyākaraṇa* (*Ācārya -Āpiśalikṛta Āpisali...*)

4 *Ṛṣi Śākaṭāyanakṛta Śākaṭāyana-Vyākaraṇa*

5 *Ṛṣi Pāṇinikṛta Pāṇini-Vyākaraṇa*

6 *Ṛṣi Samantabhadrakṛta Samantabhadra-Vyākaraṇa*[5]

4 མི་མཁའ་རྒྱ་མཚོའི་ འདས་ལོ་ དྲུག་ཅུ་སྐོར་ བཅུ་རང་ཉ་ གསུམ་ཅུ་ རྩ་གཅིག་ བསྐྱེ་བ་ ནམ་ འབྱུང་ ཞེས་པ་ས་མོ་ ཕྱི་ལོ་ རང་ལོ་ ཉེར་ ལྔར་ སླེབ་པ་ ཆུ་སྟོད་ ཟླ་བའི་ ཡར་ཚེས་ དགེ་བར་ འགོ་ བཙམས།

ཀུན་ལྡན་ ཞེས་བ་ལྕགས་ བྱི་ནག་པ་ཟླ་བའི་ དམར་ཕྱོགས་ཀྱི་ རྒྱལ་བ་ གསུམ་པ་ བ་ཤའི་ འགྲུབ་ སྦྱོར་གྱི་ དུས་དགེ་བར་ཚེས་ གྲ་ཆེན་པོ་ དཔལ་ལྡན་ འབྲས་སྤུངས་ཀྱི་ རང་ཞག་ རྒྱུད་སྟེང་ སྤྱིལ་པོར་སྦྱར་བ་ འདིས་ཀྱང་ བསྟན་པ་དང་ སེམས་ཅན་ ཡོངས་ལ་ ཕན་པར་ གྱུར་ཅིག ༎

5 Samantabhadra was a Jain grammarian; he is mentioned by the Jain grammarian Pūjyapāda or Jainendra (about 500 A.D.) in his *Jainendra-vyākaraṇa*.

7 *Ṛṣi Patañjalikṛta Patañjali-Vyākaraṇa*

8 *Manujendrakṛta Manujendra-Vyākaraṇa*

The *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* which was composed by Rāmacandra towards the latter part of the 14th century A.D., was the first exhaustive and elaborate attempt to classify the sūtras of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, according to different topics or subjects treated in grammars. The *Rūpāvatāra* of Dharmakīrti, and the *Rūpamālā* of Vimalasarasvatī, which also attempted to classify the sūtras of the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, in the similar method, though not so elaborately, were composed probably at the same time, or a little before. Whether Rāmacandra got any inspiration or help from these works, is not known.

The *Kātantra* (probably first century A.D.) and the *Mugdhabodha* (13th century A.D.) where the sūtras are arranged according to the subjects dealt with in grammars, might have inspired the author of *Prakriyā-Kaumudī*. He has frequently referred to these grammars in his works.

Bhaṭṭojī Dīkṣita seems to have utilised the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* to a great extent, in composing his *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*. The arrangement of the sūtras in the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*, is very similar to that in the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī*, and the vṛttis of these two treatises are so similar that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish them; but the original sūtras of Pāṇini quoted in the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī*, in some places are different from that which are in *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*. Sometimes the *vārtikas* are included in the sūtras and thus new sūtras are made up. This sort of alternation of the original sūtras of Pāṇini is seen in *Kāśikā* too; for example:—

1 *grāmajanabandhubhyastal* 4-2-43. *Prakriyā* and *Kāśikā* read this sūtra as follows:—*grāmajanabandhusahāyebhyastal*. *gajasahāyābhyāṃ ceti vaktavyam* is the vārtika found in the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*, while *gajāccesṭa* is found as the vārtika in the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī*.

2 *lākṣārocahāṭṭhak* 4-2-2. *Prakriyā* and *Kāśikā* read it as *lākṣārocanaśakalakardamāṭṭhak*. *śakalakardamābhyāmupasaṃkhyānam* is found as the vārtika in the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*.[6]

3 *svāṅgāccetaḥ* 6-3-40. *Prakriyā* and *Kāśikā* read it as *svāṅgāccetomānin*. *amāninīti vaktavyam* is to be seen as the vārtika in *Siddhānta-*

(For details see *Swami Samantabhadra* by Yugalkishor Muktear, Jaina-Grantha-Ratnākar-Kāryālaya, Bombay).

6 शकलकर्दमयोर्वार्तिके दर्शनात् सूत्रे प्रक्षेप इति पदमञ्जरी ।

Kaumudī. It may be mentioned here that the suggested reading in the *Mahābhāṣya* supports the reading of the *Prakriyā* and the *Kāśikā*.[7]

4 *īṣadarthe* 6-3-105. *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* reads *īṣadarthe ca*.

5 *ātmanaśca* 6-3-6. *Prakriyā* ahd *Kāśikā* read it as—*ātmanaśca pūraṇe*. *pūraṇa iti vaktavyam* is found as the vārtika in the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*.[8] Here too the suggested reading of the *Mahābhāṣya* supports the reading of the *Prakriyā* and *Kāśikā*.

6 *sāsmin paurṇamāsīti* 4-2-21. *Prakriyā* and *Kāśikā* read it as:—*sāsmīn paurṇamāsīti sañjāyām*. The vṛtti of the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī* reads—*iti śabdāt sañjāyāmiti labhyate*.

Besides this, different readings of the original sūtras (of *Pāṇini*) are also to be found in the Mss. of the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī;* for example:—

1 *ekataddhite ca* 6-3-62. is the reading found in *Mahābhāṣya* and also in the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī;* but *Prakriyā* has two readings: *eka taddhite ca* and *ekasya taddhite ca*. The second reading is supported by the Tibetan translation.

2. *adhyardhapūrva-dvigor-lugasañjāyām* 5-1-28. Two Mss. of the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* read *pūrvād* for *pūrva*. Tib. reads *pūrvād*. It should be mentioned here that one of the Mss. of the *Mahābhāṣya* too supports this reading.

3 *vibhāṣā supo bahuc purastāt tu* 5-3-68. Five Mss. of the *Prakriyā* omit *tu*. There is no *tu* in the Tibetan translation.

4 *lvādibhyaḥ* 8-2-44. Three Mss. of the *Prakriyā* read it as *lvādibhyaśca*; Tib. supports this reading.

5 *apaparibahirañcavaḥ pañcamya* 2-1-12; a Ms. of the *Prakriyā* adds *vibhāṣā*, which is supported by the Tib. translation and also by the *Mahābhāṣya*. The latter reads it as follows:—*vibhāṣāparibahī*......

6 *bhāvavacanāśca* 3-3-11. A Ms. of the *Prakriyā* reads it as: *bhāvavacanācca*.

7 *vamorvā* 8-4-23. *Prakriyā* has two readings of this sūtra: *vamorvā* and *mvorvā*. Tib. supports the former one.

8 *sadiraprateḥ* 8-3-66. A Ms. of the *Prakriyā* reads it as *saderaprateḥ*. Tib. supports the former reading.

7 अमानिनीति वार्तिके दर्शनात् सूत्रे प्रक्षिप्तमिति पदमञ्जरी

8 वार्तिकमेवेदं सूत्ररूपेण पठितमिति पदमञ्जरी ।

9 *īilornuglukāvanyatarasyāṃ snehavipātane* 7-3-39. This is the reading found in the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī* and *Kāśikā*. but the *Prakriyā* has two readings:—*snehanipātane* and *snehavipātane*. Tib. omits *snehavipātane* or *-nipātane*, which is an obvious mistake.

10 *ato bhisa ais* 7-1-9, is the reading found in *Mahābhāṣya*, *Kāśikā* and *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*; but *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* has another reading: *ato bhis ais*; this is found in five Mss.

11 *tena nirvṛttam* 4-2-68, this is the reading to be seen in *Mahābhāṣya*, *Kāśikā* and *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*; but *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* has three readings: *tena nirvṛttam*, *tena nirvṛttaḥ*, and *tena nirvṛtaḥ*.

12 *ḍhinvikṛṇvyora* ca 3-1-80. Four Mss. of *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* read it as *Dhinvikṛṇvyorac ca*.

13 *somāṭ ṭyaṇ* 4-2-30. A Ms. of *Prakriyā Kaumudī* reads it as *somād yaṇ*, which is supported by the Tibetan translation.

The Tibetan translation with all its defects is praiseworthy. To translate the grammar of Pāṇini in a foreign language is not an easy task. It is really a great and successful attempt of a young man of 25.

I have compared the translation of this *Pāṇini-vyākaraṇa-sūtra* with the original sūtras of Pāṇini, that are found in *Mahābhāṣya*, *Kāśikā*, *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* and *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*, and I have a mind to record the differences in details in a separate paper. Here I like to mention a remarkable reading, which is found in none of the Mss. (as many as I have seen) of the *Prakriyā-Kaumuḍī*; neither it is found in *Mahābhāṣya*, *Kāśikā* nor in the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*.

नभ्राएणपान्नवेदानासत्यानमुचिनकुलनखनपुंसकनक्षत्रनक्रनाकेषु प्रकृत्या 6. 3. 75.

In this sūtra the word *nagna* is found between *nakṣatra* and *nakra* which is really surprising. In *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* there is the following vārtika:—नग्ननागनाभागनाराचनाचिकेतनापितनमेरुननान्दनभसनान्तरीयकादिषु वाच्यम् where *nagna* is found; but there is no vārtika of any kind either in the *Kāśikā* or in the *Siddhānta-Kaumudī*. However it is in the vārtika of the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* and not in its original sūtra. Now the question is, from where the translator got this word. Did he add this from the vārtika or this was in the original sūtra of the Ms. of the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī* from which he translated. If it was there, then the question is, whether this word *nagna* was in the original sūtra of Pāṇini, or it was added in the sūtra by the author of the *Prakriyā-Kaumudī*. This is a subject of research for the scholars.

SUJITKUMAR MUKHOPADHYAYA

A Side-light on the later Upaniṣadic Eschatology

Among the authentic Upaniṣads the *Chāndogya* and the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* maintain that there are three stages or courses for men after death.[1] The first two are variously called *deva-yāna* and *pitṛ-yāna, arcirādi-mārga* and *dhūma-yāna, uttarāyaṇa* and *dakṣiṇāyaṇa, śukla-gati* and *kṛṣṇagati,* and so on. Generally speaking, the people who are of better, or rather of a unique, spiritual calibre are considered competent for the former route, viz., *deva-yāna,* and are not required to be re-born. The second category of men are formed generally by the ordinary sacrificers or 'workers' who are desirous of sense pleasures in their heavenly residence afterwards; they follow accordingly the *pitṛ-yāna.* The third has been sarcastically designated as '*Jāyasva-mriyasva*', 'be born and die' by the *Chāndogya* and is meant for the rest. This stands for the idea of a ceaseless chain of repeated births and deaths. There is still another path formulated by the authority in point which can conveniently be designated as 'non-path' in consideration of the case of the handful of the *Jīvan-muktas* or the soul liberated even in life. They are not to go to any sphere of existence on the expiry of their liege of life—they merge into the Absolute Brahman as soon as they die.[2]

With the foregoing discussion serving as the context we may here take up some passages of the *Varāha-upaniṣad,* a very late treatise of the class. In it (IV. 34-44) we have a unique and perhaps unparalleled disquisition on eschatology. This Upaniṣad is a Yogic one and as such freely draws on the Yoga-lore along with its terminology. It consists of five chapters all of which have been started with the conversations between the sage Ṛbhu and Varāha, one of the ten incarnations of God. Just prior to the Varāha passage as referred to above we find a considerably long description of the *Jīvan-mukta,* a soul freed from the bondage of life even while living in the physical sense of the term. It looks like a summation of the relevant topics of the *Gītā* (e.g. that of the *brāhmī-sthiti* in the second chapter). Thereupon the Upaniṣad makes a bold assertion that only two sages, Śuka and Vāmadeva, so far have been blessed with the attainment of the final emancipation and that none else is so privileged as they are. This is obviously an attempt to preface the peculiar argument that there are two paths called after the

1 See *Ch. Up.*, V. 10; *Bṛh. Up.*, II. 15-16.

2 E.g. *Bṛh. Up.*, III. 2. 11.

names of the two great saints, whereby the aspirants of rare spiritual acumen are to proceed after their death.

As for the personality of the two, we know that Vāmadeva, the son of Gotama, appears as a very old Ṛgvedic seer of the fourth *maṇḍala*. The name has been mentioned in the *Aitareya Upaniṣad* and a few other Vedic treatises. Śuka is undoubtedly an epic sage (*Mbh.* XII. 324-333) looked upon as a great spiritual giant who is reported by tradition to have attained perfection immediately on his birth[3] and his name has been alluded to throughout the pages of the later-day literature including the *Mahā* and the *Śuka-rahasya Upaniṣads*. In the *Mahā* also his name is associated with the conception of the *Jīvan-mukta,* and in the latter is found a short account of his life and attainments which is obviously a recast of the narrative, *inter alia,* of the *Mahābhārata,* and the *Devī-bhāgavata,* I. 14-20.

Śuka and Vāmadeva have been characterised as a bird and an ant respectively and this metaphoric sketch supplies the key-note to their character. This also accounts for the reason why the paths owe their names to them. We have seen that the former was a liberated soul and the latter is believed to have attained perfection after much endeavour. Herein lies the root of this comparison. Those aspiring and quietistic souls that are to follow the '*Śuka-patha*' or 'the path of Śuka' become qualified for emancipation just after death. The conception of this path is based upon that of the *Jīvan-muktas* of the earlier Upaniṣads and it ignores the idea of *deva-yāna* altogether. The people who by dint of their phenomenal perseverance and spiritual fervour have managed to eradicate the last trace of *avidyā* or the spots of the mind are deemed fit to attain this path. It has been declared that all their sense organs and the five elements to which they owe their existence in this birth become one with the elemental cosmos as soon as they expire. The Yoga expedients have been prescribed for both the classes of people who are believed to pass through these courses. The *Vāmadeva-patha,* however, implies that the liberation as the desideratum of the aspirants' life will be due after a series of births pervaded through by constant and strenuous spiritual practices. It has been declared in this Upaniṣad that both the parts, of necessity, lead to the Brahman or final eman-

3 शुको नाम महातेजाः स्वरूपानन्द-तत्परः ।
जातमात्रेण मुनिराड् यत् सत्यं तदवाप्तवान् ॥ —*Mahā Upaniṣad,* II. 1.

cipation, but the difference between them is only the question of to-day or to-morrow, now or after,—the real point of distinction being the time factor.

The *Śuka-patha* as we have already noticed represents the state of emancipation immediately after death; and the above discussion does not fail to impress upon the reader the notion that the *Vāmadeva-patha* conveys the idea of *pitṛ-yāna* through which people are destined to come into repeated existences (saṃsāra). Although this latter class of men seeks after pleasure here and hereafter, the attachment gradually diminishes as they pass from one birth to another till finally they merge into the state of *samādhi*, the highest spiritual stage, and thus the emancipated soul becomes completely identified with the Brahman. The catholic spirit of the Upaniṣads discourages none; it is for everybody. Discernible are the rays of hope in the pages of the Upaniṣads before the fallen humanity, masters in reality who play the rôle of servants.

Now a point of note we here intend to insist upon. It is this that the two courses of the Varāha account have been named after the two renowned sages. This looks like an unprecedented convention throughout the whole range of the philosophical literature of India. Needless it is to point out that the two-fold division in point is admittedly a clumsy one and too short,—they do not represent all the stages which the souls are believed to undergo after death.

JAGADISHCHANDRA MITRA

Chronology of the Reign of the Imperial Pratihāra Nāgabhaṭa II

Almost all scholars are agreed in regarding the following as the chief events of the reign of the Imperial Pratihāra ruler Nāgabhaṭa II:—

1. Defeat of the rulers of Sindh, Āndhra, Vidarbha and Kaliṅga.
2. Defeat of Cakrāyudha, the ruler of Kanauj.
3. Defeat of Dharmapāla, the ruler of Bengal.
4. Capture of strongholds in Matsya, Mālava, Turuṣka, and Kirāta.
5. His own defeat at the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Govinda III.

But there is unfortunately no unanimity regarding the sequence in which these events occurred. Dr. Tripathi, for instance, puts the defeat of Dharmapāla after the deposition of Cakrāyudha and Nāgabhaṭa II's own discomfiture at the hands of Govinda III and regards No. 1 as the last

important event in the Partihāra ruler's political career.[1] Diametrically opposed to this is the view of Dr. R. C. Majumdar who, regarding the Nāgabhaṭa II's defeat at the hands of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas as decisive, would not concede the priority of the struggle with them. Further, he as well as Dr. Altekar consider No. 1 as the first instead of the last achievement of Nāgabhaṭa, and giving rather a novel interpretation to one of the verses from the Gwalior inscription, suggests that Nāgabhaṭa should be regarded as having allied himself with, rather than as having beaten, the rulers of Sindh, Āndhra, Kaliṅga and Vidarbha before attacking Dharmapāla.[2] Next to this event they put the capture of forts in Matsya etc. and give the defeat by Govinda III the last place in his history.

Neither of these chronologies appears wholly reliable to me. I do not see why Dr. Tripathi should change the order of events found in the Gwalior inscription and regard No. 1 as the last political event of Nāgabhaṭa's reign. Nor do I find Dr. Majumdar's arguments very convincing, for if Dharmapāla could, according to his own showing, suffer more than one defeat at the hands of the Pratihāras, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and probably also the Tibetans[3] and yet remain strong enough to be the overlord of Northern India, why cannot Nāgabhaṭa II be supposed to have been first beaten by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and then recovered strength enough, in his turn, to beat Dharmapāla? He does not object, besides, to such a sequence of events in the case of Nāgabhaṭa II's grandson Bhoja who is believed to have been defeated by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, the Pālas, and the Pratihāras of Maṇḍor, and yet to have, towards the end, gathered strength enough to beat all these parties.[4] In fact, both the chronologies mentioned are equally sound or unsound, being at least partly based on mere conjecture. So we must, without allowing ourselves to be influenced by them, try, if possible, to find some other means to settle the course of Nāgabhaṭa's career.

That such means are not absolutely wanting will be obvious enough if we turn to the copper-plate inscription of Avanivarman Yoga, son of one Balavarman who was alive up to 893 A.D. (V. 950).[5] Now, according to this record Balavarman's grandfather Vāhukadhavala (who was probably, like

1 *History of Kanauj*, pp. 230-6.

2 *History of Bengal*, p. 112, note 3. *Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their times*, pp. 64-65.

3 *History of Bengal*, pp. 110-12.

4 See the *Journal of the Department of Letters*, X, pp. 47-55.

5 *E.I.*, IX, pp. 1-10.

Yoga, a Pratihāra feudatory) had defeated the forces of one Dharma[6] who is obviously Dharmapāla of Bengal. If we assume 893 A.D. to be the date of Balavarman's death and assign 25 years to each generation, the first year for Vāhukadhavala's chieftainship and the earliest for his fight with Dharmapāla would be 818 A.D. A date very near to this is arrived at also by reference to the inscription of the Pratihāras of Maṇḍor. As Kakkuka was alive in V. 918 (*c.* 861 A.D.),[7] the Gauḍa ruler that his father is said to have fought against and defeated must be Dharmapāla and the year of the fight should in the normal course be after 810 A.D. Nāgabhaṭa II's struggle with the Rāṣṭrakūṭas must be placed nearly ten years earlier than this, as it is referred to in the Manne plates of 802 A.D. now regarded as genuine, and the Nausari plates of 805 A.D.

With the question of the priority of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa and Pāla struggle thus settled, we can now proceed with the task of assigning the other events to their proper places. The Gwalior inscription of Bhoja speaks of the Sindh, Āndhra, Kaliṅga, and Vidarbha rulers being subjugated while Nāgabhaṭa was a mere youth and places it among the first of his achievements. I think it best to stick to this order and regard the subjugation of these princes lying on the northern boundary of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kingdom as the chief cause of the Pratihāra-Rāṣṭrakūṭa fighting in Nāgabhaṭa II's reign.[8] The Rāṣṭrakūṭas won the first round, but on Govinda III's returning to the south, Nāgabhaṭa slowly recuperated his strength, and, after an interval of nearly ten years, first wrested Kanauj from Cakrāyudha, the vassal of Dharmapāla, and then proceeded to the battle near Monghyr. With his power increased by the booty gained in this successful war, he appears to have next embarked on a further career of conquest after 813 A.D. or so. He put the Rāṣṭrakūṭas on the defensive, defeated some of their armies[9] and carrying his incursions into Matsya, Mālava, Kirāta, and Turuṣka countries, forcibly captured their

6 *Ibid.*, p. 7, v. 9 of the plates of Avanivarman II Yoga. Two verses later the plate mentions also the defeat of a Karṇāṭa army by Vāhukadhavala. But as no ruler is mentioned, and Vāhukadhavala's date is, as will be shown, after A.D. 815 or so, the Karṇāṭa chief defeated by him should be identified with Amoghavarṣa I.

7 This is the date of his Ghaṭiyālā inscription.

8 That Pratihāras entered in no alliance with these rulers, though such is the conclusion reached by Dr. Majumdar, Tripathi and Altekar, has been shown elsewhere and I think it unnecessary to repeat the arguments here. (See *Journal of Indian History*, XXII, p. 103).

9 See v. 11 of the plate of Avanivarman II Yoga referred to already in Note 6.

strongholds and annexed perhaps also some of their territory to his own dominions. The Buchkala inscription gives him the high-sounding titles of *Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhirāja-Parameśvara* and shows that he was alive at least upto V. 815.[10] The *Prabhāvakacarita* puts his death in V. 890. Though this appears rather late on account of the first inscription of his grandson Bhoja being dated in V. 893, there is nothing improbable about it. Inscriptional as well as literary evidence appears to suggest that Nāgabhaṭa II's son Rāmabhadra had a short and inglorious reign.[11] Such being the case, the reign-period of three years is, in our opinion, sufficient for Rāmabhadra, and Nāgabhaṭa II's death might consequently be put in V. 890 without much fear of our being wrong.

The chronology constructed as the result of the above discussion can be put as follows:—

1.	Accession of Nāgabhaṭa.	*c.* 793 A.D.
2.	Defeat of the Āndhra, Vidarbha, Kaliṅga and Sindh rulers.	*c.* 799-801 A.D.
3.	Defeat by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa ruler Govinda III.	*c.* 801 A.D.
4.	Deposition of Cakrāyudha and conquest of Kanauj.	*c.* 812 A.D.
5.	The Bengal Campaign.	*c.* 813 A.D.
6.	Further attacks on the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and conquests in Matsya, Mālava, Turuṣka, and Kirāta lands.	*c.* 813- 33 A.D.
7.	Death of Nāgabhaṭa.	V. 890 (833 A.D.)

DASHARATHA SHARMA

10 *E.I.*, IX, p. 199 f.

11 See in this connection the present writer's paper "Studies in the *Prabhāvakacarita*" published in the *Jain Antiquary*.

A Note on the Genealogy of the Somavaṃśis

Most of the Somavaṃśī charters are incised on three copper-plates. A charter engraved on three plates of copper appears to have been technically known in the Somavaṃśī realm as a *tri-palī-tāmra-śāsana,* although scholars take this expression, which actually occurs in the Cuttack grants (cf. *EI.*, III, pp. 345, 350) of the 31st regnal year of the Somavaṃśī ruler Mahā-Bhavagupta Janamejaya, to mean "a set of three connected copper-plate charters."

Earlier writers on the Somavaṃśis speak of king Mahā-Bhavagupta Janamejaya, son of Śivagupta, as Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya, as they believe that his are the earliest records belonging to the Somavaṃśī rulers, if of course they are not taken to be direct descendants of the earlier Pāṇḍu-vaṃśī kings of Kosala, i.e., South Kosala. According to this view the genealogy of the earlier members of the family may be represented as follows: —

1. Śivagupta; according to some, Śivagupta I, as they take the name to be the same as that of the grandson of this king? No record of his time is known. His son—

2. Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya who is known to have issued the following charters: (1) Sonepur grant of year 3 (*EI.*, XI, p. 94 f); (2) 3 Patna and Kalibhana[1] grants of year 6 (*JPASB.*, N.S., I, p. 12 f.; *EI.*, III, p. 341 ff.); (3) Satalma grant of year 8 (*EI.*, VIII, p. 141 ff.); (4) 3 Cuttack grants of year 31 (*ib,* III, p. 347 ff.); (5) Sonepur grant of year 17 (*ib,* XXIII, p. 250 ff.); (6) Kalibhana[1] grant of year 34. His son—

3. Mahā-Śivagupta I Yayāti; but according to those who take the name to be the same as that of the grandfather of this king, Mahā-Śivagupta II Yayāti. He is supposed to have issued the following charters: (1) Jatesinga-Dungri grant of year 3 (*JBORS.*, II, p. 52 ff.), (2) Patna grant of year 8 (Bhandarkar, *List,* No. 1565); (3) Cuttack grant of year 9 (*ib,* No. 1566); (4) Sonepur grant of year 15 (*ib,* No. 1567); (5) Patna grant of year 24 (*ib,* No. 1568); (6) Patna grant of year 28 (*ib,* No. 1569). His son—

4 Mahā-Bhavagupta II Bhīmaratha known from his (1) Cuttack grant of year 3 (*ib,* No. 1570) and (2) Kudopali grant of year 13 (*EI.*, IV, p. 258 f).

1 The Kālibhanā grants of the 6th and 34th years of Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya are being edited for this journal by the author of the present note jointly with Mr. P. C. Rath.

It has been recently suggested by Bhandarkar (*List*, pp. 215-16, 403) that the Jatesinga-Dungri charter of Mahā-Śivagupta Yayāti, son of Mahā-Bhavagupta actually belongs to Śivagupta (No. 1 of the preceding genealogical list) and that the Kudopali grant of Mahā-Bhavagupta son of Mahā-Śivagupta belongs not to No. 4 of the same list, but to No. 2. i.e. Mahā-Bhavagupta son of Śivagupta. The second suggestion has been offered without any discussion of the earlier view and appears to be due merely to carelessness; as to the first suggestion however it has been pointed out that Mahā-Śivagupta Yayāti of the Jatesinga-Dungri inscription seems to be the founder of the dynasty as he is said to have acquired Trikaliṅga through his own arms and as his father Mahā-Bhavagupta is given no royal title. This theory therefore suggests the following genealogy of the early Somavaṃśī kings.

1. Mahā-Bhavagupta I mentioned in the Jatesinga-Dungri inscription without any title. His son—
2. Mahā-Śivagupta I Yayāti who issued the Jatesinga-Dungri grant; the same as Śivagupta, No. 1 of the preceding genealogical list. His son—
3. Mahā-Bhavagupta II Janamejaya, same as No. 2 of the above list. His son—
4. Mahā-Śivagupta II Yayāti, same as No. 3 of the above list. His son—
5. Mahā-Bhavagupta III Bhīmaratha, same as No. 4 of the above list.

It may be pointed out that Bhandarkar's theory as explained above has already been accepted by some recent writers on the subject who have represented Mahā-Bhavagupta son of Śivagupta as Mahā-Bhavagupta II (cf. Chhabra, *EI.*, XXIII, p. 248) apparently without examining the case carefully.

As a matter of fact, Bhandarkar's theory cannot be accepted without further evidence. If the Jatesinga-Dungri inscription is the earliest record of the family and if it mentions the reigning king as Mahā-Śivagupta and his father as Mahā-Bhavagupta, it becomes inexplicable why, in all the ten records of his son, Mahā-Śivagupta is simply called Śivagupta although he is endowed with all the paramount titles. Apparently Śivagupta's son could not have committed such a blunder if his father's style was actually Mahā-Śivagupta and not Śivagupta. It must be noted that such a mistake is not noticed in any of the records of Śivagupta's grandson and great-grandson. The omission of royal titles in regard to the name

of Mahā-Bhavagupta in the Jatesinga-Dungri inscription has to be ascribed to the carelessness of the scribe or the engraver which is characteristic of the epigraphs of this period. The passage *sva-bhuj-opārjjita-trikaliṅg-ādhipati* may indicate the king's success against a rival's claim for the throne, a revolt of the feudatories, and any similar danger. It is not to be taken too literally. The hyperbolic claims of the king regarding a number of other countries moreover appear to suggest that the whole is a mere *praśasti*.

There is an interesting point to which attention of scholars should be drawn in this connection. The records of Mahā-Bhavagupta, son of Śivagupta, show that his *mahāsāndhivigrahin* (minister for peace and war) was Malla Datta, son of Dhāra Datta. This Malla Datta was in service as early as the king's 6th regnal year (cf. the Patna grant, Bhandarkar, *List*, No. 1558) and continued to occupy the post up till the 31st regnal year (cf. the Cuttack grant, *EI.*, III, p. 350). In the Kalibhana grant of the 34th year of Mahā-Bhavagupta, the *mahāsāndhivigrahin* is found to be Dhāra Datta who appears to have been the son and successor of Malla Datta, named after his grandfather. This Dhāra Datta II is known to have held the ministerial office not only during the latest years of Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya, but also up to the 24th regnal year of his son and successor Mahā-Śivagupta I Yayāti (cf. the Patna grant, Bhandarkar, No. 1568; for the reading Cāru Datta, cf. *EI.*, XI, p. 98, n. 1; the reading Chicchaṭeśva is either due to a mistake or refers to an officiating minister, cf. *ib.*, III, p. 354). The minister Dhāra Datta II was then succeeded in or a little before the 28th regnal year of Mahā-Śivagupta (cf. the Patna grant, *ib.*, No. 1569) by Siṃha Datta no doubt belonging to the same family of the Dattas. Siṃha Datta is known to have been in office upto the 3rd year of the next king Mahā-Bhavagupta II Bhīmaratha (*EI.*, III, p. 358). It must be noted that the Jatesinga-Dungri grant of a Mahā-Śivagupta's 3rd regnal year was written by the *mahāsāndhivigrahin* Rudra Datta who was the brother's son of Siṃha Datta and grandson of Harṣa Datta. As this Siṃha Datta seems to be no other than the Siṃha Datta who was a minister during the reigns of Mahā-Śivagupta I Yayāti and of Mahā-Bhavagupta II Bhīmaratha, the Mahā-Śivagupta in whose 3rd regnal year was issued the Jatesinga-Dungri charter written by Siṃha Datta's brother's son Rudra Datta would be a later king of the family. The name of *mahāsāndhivigrahin* Rudra Datta is not mentioned in any record of Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya and of his son Mahā-Śivagupta I Yayāti; but it is actually found in the Balijhari inscription (Bhandar-

kar, *op. cit.*, No. 2076) belonging to a Somavaṃśī king who seems to have been the great-great-grandson of Mahā-Bhavagupta I. This record speaks of the Somavaṃśī king Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya; then Mahā-Śivagupta I Yayāti; then Mahā-Bhavagupta II Bhīmaratha; then the brothers Dharmaratha, Nahuṣa and Mahā-Śivagupta II Yayāti; then the son of the last named, Mahā-Bhavagupta III Uddyotakeśarin whose 4th regnal year is the date of the charter. The identification of the *mahāsāndhivigrahin* Rudra Datta mentioned in both the Jatesinga-Dungri and Balijhari grants suggests that Mahā-Śivagupta Yayāti, son of Mahā-Bhavagupta, as mentioned in the former charter is no other than Mahā-Śivagupta II Yayāti who was the father of Mahā-Bhavagupta III Uddyotakeśarin and apparently the son of Mahā-Bhavagupta II Bhīmaratha. This identification seems to be supported by the fact that Mahā-Śivagupta II Yayāti of the Balijhari inscription is said to have wrested Kośala and Utkala from hostile princes, whereas the Jatesinga-Dungri grant represents Mahā-Śivagupta Yayāti as the choice-husband of Kaliṅga, Koṅgoda, Utkala and Kośala and that such claims are not noticed in regard to any other king of the dynasty. Apparently the same Rudra Datta is mentioned as the *mahāsāndhivigrahin* Rudra Datta, son of Deva Datta, in the Kesarkela grant (*EI.*, XXII, p. 138) of the 11th year of a Mahā-Bhavagupta who may be identified with Mahā-Bhavagupta III Uddyotakeśarin himself or less probably with Mahā-Bhavagupta II Bhīmaratha. We do not know if Rudra Datta became a minister during the later years of Bhīmaratha and if the unknown length of the reign of Mahā-Śivagupta II and possibly also of his two brothers would permit such a hypothesis. Bhandarkar's ascription of the Kudopali grant to Mahā-Bhavagupta I is improbable in view of the fact that it represents the king as the son of Mahā-Śivagupta instead of Śivagupta and as residing at Yayātinagara. As a matter of fact, this city figures in Somavaṃśī epigraphy only from the 24th year of Mahā-Śivagupta I, son of Mahā-Bhavagupta I. The suggestion that Mahā-Śivagupta I Yayāti gave the name Yayātinagara to Vinītapura (identified with modern Binka), the earlier seat of his government, may or may not be accepted; but it should be noticed that Mahā-Bhavagupta I issued his charters from Suvarṇapura (modern Sonepur; years 3, 34), Mūrasīman (modern Mursingā in the Patna State; years 6, 8) and Ārāma (supposed to have been a pleasure garden near Suvarṇapura; years 17, 31). Sometimes the word *kaṭaka* is used in regard to the places of issue of the charters. The word is now taken to indicate a

royal camp (cf. °*samāvāsita*°); although according to medieval lexicons it also means a *nagarī* or *rājadhānī* (cf. *skandhāvāra* in *Successors of the Sātavāhanas*, pp. 47-48). In any case, Mahā-Bhavagupta I is not known to have issued any charter from Vinītapura or Yayātinagara and we do not know if any Yayāti, after whom the city is named, existed in the dynasty before Mahā-Śivagupta I Yayāti. The Kudopali grant should therefore be attributed to Mahā-Bhavagupta II Bhīmaratha or Mahā-Bhavagupta III Uddyotakeśarin.

The Somavaṃśī kings call themselves *trikaliṅg-ādhipati*, lord of the Trikaliṅga country, and inscriptions of the earlier members of the family show that they were in possession of the Sambalpur tract or the south-eastern part of the South Kosala *janapada* identified with Chhattisgarh or the Raipur-Sambalpur-Bilaspur region. The exact location of the Trikaliṅga country is unknown (cf. *Select Inscriptions*, I, p. 459 n); but it may have comprised a tract of land between South Kosala and Kaliṅga and possibly included the present Sambalpur region.[2] According to some scholars the Somavaṃśīs of Trikaliṅga were descendants of the earlier Pāṇḍuvaṃśīs of South Kośala. Palæography suggests a big gap between the last known Pāṇḍuvaṃśī king and the first of the Somavaṃśīs and inspite of the fact that there was a Mahā-Śivagupta amongst the Pāṇḍuvaṃśīs the suggestion cannot be accepted until further evidence is forthcoming. Though there is a considerable difference of opinion as regards the date of the two dynasties, we are inclined to assign the Pāṇḍuvaṃśīs to about the 6th-7th centuries and the Somavaṃśīs to about the 10th-12th centuries. The later Somavaṃśīs were pressed by the Kalacuris and pushed towards Orissa proper. But ultimately they were probably ousted from Trikaliṅga which became a bone of contention between the Kalacuris and the Gaṅgas. The Somavaṃśīs appear to have been later ousted from Orissa by the Gaṅgas.

As to the date of the Somavaṃśīs, it should be noted that Fleet took their charters to belong to a period later than 900 A.D. and assigned them

2 The Somavaṃśī kings are sometimes represented as lords of Kosala (South Kosala). Their *Sāndhivigrahins* are sometimes referred to as belonging to the Kosala country in earlier records and to the Kosala and Utkala countries in later epigraphs. The reading *Karalīnāṃ* in relation to Yayātinagara in the *Pavanadūta* (v. 26) is certainly a mistake for *Kosalīnāṃ*. The geographical name Trikaliṅga is not often met with outside the expression *trikaliṅgādhipati*. It is therefore not impossible that it was used to indicate parts of Kosala, Kaliṅga and Utkala.

roughly to the 11th century (*EI.*, p. 333). According to Kielhorn, the form of initial *e* made of a vertical line with (on the left of it) a semi-circle open to the left in the Kudopali grant "proves more convincingly perhaps than is done by anything else that this inscription cannot have been written earlier than about the first half of the 12th century A.D." (*EI.*, IV, p. 256). It should however be admitted that almost similar form of the initial *e* is noticed in such East Indian records of the 9th and 10th centuries A.D. as the Monghyr and Nālandā grants of Devapāla and the Irda grant of Nayapāla. As suggested above the Kudopali grant may be assigned to Mahā-Bhavagupta III Uddyotakeśarin who seems to have flourished about the middle of the 11th century.[3]

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that, as already noticed by scholars (*e.g.*, Bhandarkar, Ray, Acharya), the text of the Jatesinga-Dungri grant published by B. C. Mazumdar contains numerous mistakes and I am trying to get the original plates with the purpose of reediting the inscription. For the present it may be noted that the following important corrections are suggested by the plates published with Mazumdar's paper.

L. 10. श्रीपञ्च(।*)म्बरिभट्टारिका०

Ll. 13-18. करणाट लाटगुर्ज[रे][4]श्वरदाहज्वरो भूविटकलत्रकाञ्चीकलापाभरणलम्पटः ।[5] कलिङ्गकोङ्गोदोत्कलककोसलास्वयम्बरः[6] प्रसिद्धगौडराढाम्बर(।*)पकर्षणो- द्धातमारुत(:*) शीताङ्शुवङ्श[7] विमलाम्बरपूरणाच[न्द्रः] । [8]स्वभुजोपार्जित- त्रिकलिङ्गाधिपतिः परममाहेश्वरः परमभट्टारकः श्रीमहाभवगुप्तपादानुध्यात-

3 I am inclined to place the first three generations of the Somavaṃśī kings (Śivagupta, Mahā-Bhavagupta I and Mahā-Śivagupta I) in *c.* 925-1000 A.D. and the next three generations (Mahā-Bhavagupta II, Dharmaratha, Nahuṣa, Mahā-Śivagupta II and Mahā-Bhavagupta III) in *c.* 1000-75 A.D. Uddyotakesarin of the Kelga (Bhandarkar, No. 1744), Khandagiri (Nos. 1571, 1573) and Bhuvaneswar (No. 1572) inscriptions appears to have been a later member of the family different from Mahā-Bhavagupta III Uddyotakesarin. The above chronological scheme is supported by the possible suggestion of Acharya that Dharmaratha is mentioned in the Tirumalai inscription (1023 A.D.) of Rājendra Cola as Indraratha or Dhīratara of the Candrakula (Somavaṃśa) ruling at Ādi° or Yātinagara (=Yayātinagara). It should also be noted that Yayātinagara presupposing the existence of king named Yayāti is known as a famous city to Dhoyin's *Pavanadūta* (v. 26) written before the end of the twelfth century A.D.

4 रे was at first left out and is engraved below the line.

5 The *daṇḍa* is superfluous.

6 Better read स्वयंवरः

7 Better read शीतांशुवंश

8 The *daṇḍa* is unnecessary.

महाराज[ा]धिरांजपरमेश्वर(:*) प्रण(f*)मतराजन्योपसेवित[9]पादारविन्दयुगलः श्रीमहाशिवगुप्त-श्रीयय(ा*)तिदेवः कुशली ॥ कोषल[10]प्रतिबद्धोङ्गाड[11]-विषयीय[बृ]हद्भूसाइग्रामू ।[12] शम्बरवाडिमण्डल संतोनर्तांखण्डीयमारञ्ज-मुराग्रामयोर्ब्राह्मणान्संपूज्य

L. 41. अस्मद्वङ्शात्तये[13]त्तोणो यः कश्चिन्नृपतिर्भवेत् ।

It is high time that the Sonepur and Patna States would jointly undertake the publication of a *Corpus* of Somavaṃśī epigraphs edited by a competent scholar. The Somavaṃśīs may really be the subject of a brilliant monograph.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

The Sixth and Seventh Syllables of an Anuṣṭubh Quarter

Mr. S. P. Chaturvedi (*IHQ.*, XIX, pp. 358-59) has commented on a remark made in our paper on the Pīparḍūlā grant. The first quarter of the *anuṣṭubh* verse on the seal of this record reads *khaḍga-dhārā-jita-bhuvaḥ.* As however a short sixth syllable is never allowed by metricians in an *anuṣṭubh* quarter, the emendation °*jitakṣiteḥ* for °*jitabhuvaḥ* was suggested just to rectify the flaw in the metre of the verse. Mr. Chaturvedi says, "as regards the odd (*viṣama*) quarters, the restriction of the *guru-ṣaṣṭha* is not strictly enforced." This is not true. As a matter of fact there is not a single authority on Sanskrit metre that allows a *laghu-ṣaṣṭha* in any quarter—odd or even—of the *anuṣṭubh* metre. Mr. Chaturvedi has however referred to some *anuṣṭubh* verses with short sixth syllable

9 There are two signs of *e-mātrā* with स. 10 Possibly कोशल.

11 Possibly ०बद्धौङ्गाड० *Oṅgāḍa* (through the intermediate form *Oṅgā-aḍa*) appears to be a corruption of *Oṅgātaṭa* the name of a *viṣaya* in the Patna grant of Mahā-Bhavagupta I (*EI.*, III, p. 341).

12 The *daṇḍa* is superfluous. Mazumdar curiously calls the charter the Mārañjamurā grant, although two villages, viz. Bṛhad-Bhusāi and Mārañjamurā, were granted by the king. Another curious mistake of Mazumdar may be noticed here. In the Vakratentali grant (*EI.*, XI, p. 94) he takes the passage राढायां वल्लिकन्दरविनिर्गताय (to one emigrated from a locality called Vallikandara in Rāḍhā राढायं वल्लिकन्दर० and finds in it the ancient name of Rerhakhol (*ib*, p. 102)!

13 Possibly अस्मद्वंशे जयत्तोणे.

in a *viṣama* quarter from a few Sanskrit *kāvyas*. But he apparently ignores the fact that in versification there is a common thing usually called "the poetic license." As for instance, the vowel before a conjunct consonant is always long according to metricians; but there are some cases where poets are known to have violated this metrical regulation in regard to the conjuncts *pra*, *hra*, *bra* and *kra* (cf. *Kumāra*, VII, 11; *Śiśupāla*, X, 60; etc.). Nevertheless, we are thankful to Mr. Chaturvedi for drawing our attention to the fact that the rule regarding the *guru-ṣaṣṭha* in an *anuṣṭubh* quarter enforced by all metricians has in some cases been violated by versifiers apparently by virtue of the "poetic license."

Again Mr. Chaturvedi considers the emendation °*jita-kṣiteḥ* with the *laghu-saptama* in an odd *anuṣṭubh* quarter as "totally wrong," because, according to him, "if the fifth and sixth syllables are short and long respectively, the seventh syllable must be long to allow the odd quarter to become a permissible variety." This opinion of his is also not acceptable. Mr. Chaturvedi's *anuṣṭubh* rule follows in this respect only a particular school of metrical authorities, in preference to the views of other schools of metricians. It is well-known that there is difference of opinion amongst authorities as regards the seventh syllable of an odd *anuṣṭubh* quarter. According to one school, followed by Mr. Chaturvedi in this instance, the syllable should be long; according to a second school represented by Saitava (*Piṅgalacchandaḥ-sūtra*, V, 18) it should be short; but according to a third school represented by Gaṅgādāsa (*Chandomañjarī*, IV, 14) the seventh syllable of an odd *anuṣṭubh* quarter may be either short or long. A few well-known *anuṣṭubh* verses with *laghu-saptama* but *laghu-pañcama* and *guru-ṣaṣṭha* in the *viṣama* quarters may be quoted to show the hollowness of Mr. Chaturvedi's criticism.

1. यदेतद्धृदयं तव तदस्तु हृदयं मम ।
   यदिदं हृदयं मम तदस्तु हृदयं तव ॥
2. पुनातु भक्तिरच्युता सदाच्युताङ्घ्रिपद्मयोः ।
   श्रुतिस्मृतिप्रमाणिका भवांबुराशितारिका ॥
3. सैतवेन पथार्णवं तीर्णो दशरथात्मजः ।
   रक्षःक्षयकरीं पुनः प्रतिज्ञां स्वेन बाहुना ॥

In conclusion it may be pointed out that the text of the charter and the verse on the seal may or may not have been due to a single author.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

The two white Umbrellas secured by Dhruva

Dhruva is known to have won two white umbrellas, the insignias of royalty at the time, in his campaign in Northern India. But the accounts differ as to the rulers who were vanquished by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and had consequently to surrender them to the victors. According to the Rādhanpur Plates of Govinda III (808 A.D.), these were snatched from Vatsarāja, though they originally belong to the ruler of Gauḍa, i.e. Bengal.[1] The Sanjan Plates (871 A.D.), of Amoghavarṣa I tell a different story. According to them, the umbrellas were captured from the ruler of Gauḍa himself while he was trying to run away (from the battlefield) in the Doab of the Ganges and the Jumna.[2] In the Begumrā Plates of Indrarāja III (915 A.D.), one of the umbrellas is said to have been captured from the ruler of Kośala and the other from a northern ruler,[3] who has been identified by the editor of the record with Çakrāyudha, the ruler of Kanauj. We propose to examine, in this short note, the veracity of these statements inasmuch as they form the basis of important conclusions reached by the historians of the Pratihāras and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas.[4]

To me the account in the Rādhanpur Plates appears to be the most reliable of the three. Its writer was either a contemporary of Vatsarāja or very nearly so and, therefore, near enough to the event to know what actually occurred. The drafter of the Sanjan Plates came 63 years later. He knew that the umbrellas captured by Dhruva belonged to the ruler of Gauḍa, but seems to have had no knowledge of the fact that they had been gained by the Rāṣṭrakūṭas indirectly. He could for that reason merely suppose that the two white umbrellas had been captured from the Gauḍa ruler while he was trying to run away in the tract lying between the Ganges and the Jumna. To conclude on the basis of his statement, as some writers have done, that the Pālas actually fought against the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the Doab in Dhruva's reign and that the Cauhāns fighting under the banner of Vatsarāja and his feudatory Durlabharāja Cāhamāna never reached Bengal does not seem cor-

1 *EI.*, VI, pp. 239 ff., verse 8. 2 *Ibid.*, XVIII, p. 244, verse 14.

3 *Ibid.*, IX, p. 30, verse 10.

4 See, for instance, Dr. Altekar's *Rāṣṭrakūṭas and their Times*, p. 57 wherein the learned writer makes Dhruva fight against the Pālas in the Doab. Dr. R. C. Majumdar is, on the basis of the statement in the Sanjan Plates, disposed to doubt the account of the Cauhān expedition to Bengal found in the *Pṛthvīrājavijaya*.

rect and justified. The Begumrā Plates were drafted even later, some 44 years after the Sanjan and 107 years after the Rādhanpur Plates. Consequently the idea that their writer had of the actual events was still hazier. He knows of Dhruva's *digvijaya* and the capture of two white umbrellas during its course. But he is not exactly sure of the rulers from whom they were captured. So he assigns one to an unnamed ruler of the north and the other to a ruler of Kośala.

To sum up, we might state that the account in these three records, though referring to one and the same event, differs on account of the gradually and naturally lessening knowledge of it with the passage of time. This is how, without any deliberate attempt on the part of the writers, the facts in Indian history get distorted and misrepresented. If we wish to reach the exact truth and to present nothing to our readers that does not conform to it, it is our duty to examine thoroughly the statements of records like the Sanjan and Begumrā Plates before we base our theories on their unstable foundations.

DASHARATHA SHARMA

Subandhu of the Mauryan Times

In *IHQ.*, XIX, 1943, pp. 69-71, I drew attention to the dramatist Subandhu who was a contemporary and minister of Candragupta Maurya and Bindusāra on the basis of references in Vāmana's *Kāvyālaṃkārasūtravṛtti*, Abhinavagupta's *Abhinavabhāratī*, Daṇḍin's *Avantisundarī* and the *Ārya-mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*. Another reference to this minister Subandhu of the Mauryan times is contained in story 143 Cāṇakyamunikathānaka in Hari-ṣeṇa's *Bṛhatkathākosa*, where he is mentioned as a minister even in the time of the Nandas

पुरेऽस्ति पाटलीपुत्रे नन्दो नाम महीपतिः ।

*   *   *

कविः सुबन्धुनामा च शकटाख्यस्तयोऽप्यमी ।
समस्तलोकविख्याता भूपतेरस्य मन्त्रिणः । śls. 1-2, p. 336.

Singhi Jaina Granthamālā 17.

V. RAGHAVAN

On the Date of the Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta of Bilvamaṅgala

Elsewhere[1] I have endeavoured to prove that the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* of Bilvamaṅgala cannot have dated later than A.D. 1300. In the Adyar Library, there is a Ms. (XI. A. 116)[2] of the work which was copied in A.D. 1418 somewhere in Deccan or Central India. "It is customary with historians to allot a period of 50 years between the actual composition of a work and its transcription, so that, in the present instance, it can be said that the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* cannot have been composed after A.D. 1368. Tradition holds that the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* was composed in the South and migrated from there to the North, and, as yet, no proof contradicting this tradition appears to have been discovered. It is a well-known fact that, in ancient India, there were no swift conveyances such as now, which would make migration easy and quick. Assuming then that *at least* 68 years should have been necessary for a work to travel from the South into Central India and gain popularity there, it is possible to point out A.D. 1300 as the *terminus ad quem* of the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* of Bilvamaṅgala."[3]

The object of this note is to point out that it is possible to narrow this limit further. The evidence in this connection is furnished by the commentary of Narendraprabhasūri on his own treatise on Poetics, the *Alaṅkāramahodadhi*.[4] In illustration of the *Adbhuta* Rasa, verse 65 of Canto II of the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* is cited in this commentary. The passage[5] in question runs as follows:

दिव्यरूपदर्शनेप्सितप्राप्ति—रम्यकाननाद्यवलोकनादिभिः स्मेरः सविकासो नेत्रविकास-रोमाञ्च-साधुवादादीनां कारणं हर्षावेग-जडताऽऽदिभिरलङ्कृतश्च चित्तविस्तारात्मा विस्मयोऽद्भुतः ।
यथा—

"कृष्णेनाम्ब ! गतेन रन्तुमधुना मृद्भक्षिता स्वेच्छया
सत्यं कृष्णक एवमाह मुशलो मिथ्याऽम्ब ! पश्याननम् ।
व्यादेहीति विकासिते शिशुमुखे माता समग्रं जगत्
दृष्ट्वा यस्य जगाम विस्मयपदं पायात् स वः केशवः ॥"

This commentary is known to have been composed in Saṃvat 1282 (= A.D. 1226). This is quite clear from its conclusion[6]:

1 H. G. Narahari, *Manuscripts Notes* (pp. 37 ff.) in the *Adyar Library Bulletin* (1944), vol. VIII, no. 1.

2 For a description of this Ms., see *Ibid*.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 46.

4 This work was published recently as Volume XCV of the *Gekwad's Oriental Series*, Baroda.

5 *Ibid.*, p. 67.

6 *Op. cit.*, p. 340.

समाप्तेयमलङ्कारमहोदधिटीका । एतस्याः प्रमाणं चेदम्—

नयन-वसु-सूर १२८२ वर्षे निष्पन्नायाः प्रमाणमेतस्याः ।

अजनि सहस्रचतुष्टयमनुष्टुभामुपरि पञ्चशती ॥

To borrow from a contemporary writer is rather an unusual phenomenon in Sanskrit literature at least. For a work to deserve such an honour, it has to become sufficiently popular. If a half-century is enough for such a process, then the *terminus ad quem* of the date of the *Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta* will have to be shifted as far back as A.D. 1176.

H. G. NARAHARI

Saṃgītacūḍāmaṇi of Jagadekamalla

Saṃgītacūḍāmaṇi is the work of Pratāpacakravartin Jagadekamalla, a Cālukya king of Kalyan (1138-1150 A.D.). Mss. of this are very rare.

Krishnamacharia (*History of Classical Sanskrit Literature,* p. 853, para 1005) notices only one Ms., and it belongs to the Andhra Sahitya Parishat Library, Madras. There is, however, another Ms. of the work in the Anup Sanskrit Library. It is fragmentary, containing the whole of the first Adhyāya and a small part of the second. Here is its description.

Country made paper 2 folia. 11″ × 5″ 12 lines in a page. 50 syllables in a line. Devanāgarī script. Old. Damaged.

In the introductory part of the work the author gives a string of Birudas attached to his name. Some of these, especially those referring to his subjugation of Gūrjara and Hoysala, have great historical significance. Also he pays homage to one Pratāpadevanārāyaṇa, but does not make clear his relationship with this ruler. Krishnamacharia (*Ibid.*, p. 190, para 89, footnote) gives the genealogy of the Western Cālukyas; but this ruler is not mentioned by him.

For information of students of history, an extract from the beginning of the work is given here:—

ईर्ष्यारोषकषायिताशयरमापादप्रणामप्रियो

राधापीनपयोधराश्रयनभःप्रस्पर्धिवक्षःस्थलः ।

गोपीचित्तविनोदनव्यतिकरे गोपीकृतात्मा स्वयं

देवानामपि देवता स भवतां पुष्णातु विष्णुः सुखम् ॥१॥

हंसीवामरनिम्नगातटगता यन्मूर्ध्नि विद्योतते
तत्फुल्लत्कुन्दरुचिप्रतानजविनी (?) रम्या हिमांशोः कलाः ।
कर्ता विस्फुरदद्रिराजतनया नेत्रोत्सवानां भृशं
स श्रेयांसि तनोतु वस्त्रिभुवनक्षेमंकरः शंकरः ॥२॥
हरस्य देहार्धधरापि वामा कामस्य कामान् परिपूरयन्ती ।
नारीषु साम्राज्यवशादिवासौ सिंहासनस्था वरदा सुगौरी ॥३॥
श्रुतिस्वरग्रामसमग्ररागवर्णक्रमस्थानघनाभिरामम् ।
संगीतचूडामणिमात्मराज्यकल्पं विधत्ते कविचक्रवर्ती ॥४॥
मतङ्गभोजप्रमुखैः कृतं यद्देशीकृतं लक्ष्यविकीर्णरूपम् ।
तदेव गम्भीरमतिस्फुटार्थं करोति राजा जगदेकमल्लः ॥५॥

यस्येयं नामावलिः ।

राजचूडामणिचूडामणिरायकन्दर्प—रायकोलाहल—रायहल्लोहल—रायश्रीपट्टरायदिशापट्ट—रायशृङ्गारु—रायवटङ्कारु—रायगलविगल—रायजगल (?)—रायजमदण्ड—रायमेरुण्ड—विविधविद्याधरधैर्यजितमन्दिर—भोगपुरंदर—शृङ्गारसारोदयसौभाग्यभाग्योदय—षोडशमहादानसंतर्पितविप्रव्रज—रायगरुडध्वज-मदगजारूढ—भगदत्त—वितरचारुदत्त—विषमहयारोहणरेवन्त—विजयलक्ष्मीकान्त—वदनप्रचण्डकोदण्डरामसंग्रामभीमबिरुदच्छुरिधाकाररविराहु—मुनेयकारसहस्रबाहसमस्तशास्त्रविद्याप्रवीण—कामिनीजनकुसुमबाण—चतुःषष्टिकलाकलापकोविदचतुरशीतिविज्ञानविशारद—गीतवाद्यनृत्यसंगीतप्रयोगवि (दग्ध)—परिहृतप्रपञ्च—नाटकनाटिकासंनिधानश्रीहर्ष—सकलजनसस्थसंवर्धनसुवर्णवर्ष—सरसकविजनसरोवरराजहंसविदग्धजनमनोऽवतंस—शुकविशुकनिकरसफलसहकार—सुभगकविवाक्चन्द्रचन्द्रिकाचकोर—निरवद्यगद्यविद्याविनोद—चम्पकामोद—प्रचण्डदायाद—तलपकन्दकुद्दाल—उद्दण्डकुमरकेदारमृगशार्दूल—अन्ध्रदेशाधीश—गौकर्णपन्नगसौपर्ण—धीरवितरणगुणसंपूर्ण—गुर्जरहृदयजर्जर—मालवेश्वरमदनमहेश्वर—डाहालहृतकुतूहल—चोलगलकाल—प्रचुरतरहाईशललक्ष्मीहरण—दक्षदक्षिणभुजादण्ड—दुष्टतममण्डलीकतमोमण्डलीमार्तण्ड—एवमादिनामाङ्कमालालङ्कृत—श्रीमत्प्रतापनारायणदेवदिव्यश्रीपादपद्मप्रसादासादितसार्वभौमसंपत्तिश्रीमत्प्रतापचक्रवर्तिजगदेकमल्लदेव इति ॥

K. Madhava Krishna Sarma

REVIEWS

THE LAW OF WAR AND PEACE IN ISLAM by Majid Khadduri, Ph.D. Assistant Professor at the Higher Teachers' College, Baghdad, Iraq. Sometime Fellow in International Relations, University of Chicago. Published by Luzac & Co., London, 1941.

This book is a very valuable contribution to the study of Islamic International law. It is well documented and is based on all the published and unpublished works in Arabic relating to the subject, and many translations, pamphlets and printed books in English, French and German. It has also been treated in a scientific way, carefully avoiding unnecessary and superflous details. It explains in a lucid style the treatment of the non-Muslims in theory and in practice and the exact difference between the Muslim International law and the Modern International law.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I, sub-divided into two chapters, is given as a background to facilitate a clear understanding of the subject, and is entitled Fundamental Concepts of Muslim Law. It gives a short but learned discussion on the concepts of Islamic religion, state and law, giving particular attention to the nature and sources of Islamic law.

Part II, under the heading The Law of War, is sub-divided into eight chapters. It discusses at length the foundations, nature, principles and types of the *jihad* (Holy War), and the rules and regulations regarding the initiation of war, military methods, status of persons and property in war and the termination of fighting. It also shows that Islam is radically different from Judaism and Christianity, that it combines the dualism of a universal religion and a universal state, and that it resorted to both peaceful and violent means for achieving the end.

The last part, sub-divided into eight chapters, deals with the law of peace. It gives us a detailed account of the procedure and rules regarding the *aman* (pledge of security) granted, the treaties concluded, the practice of arbitration followed to settle disputes, the status of *Dhimmis* (non-Muslims allowed to live in the world of Islam) and diplomacy practised in Islam relating to the correspondence carried on and the envoys and missions sent out and received. It explains how due to the failure to establish a World Islamic State, there came into existence the world of Islam and the world of War, and how Islamic international law recognising diplomatic relations and

treaty engagements with the states in the world of war who were not recognised in a legal sense, differed from the modern international law. It also proves that peace in Islam did not mean entirely normal relations, for it was always considered as a temporary measure in which the equality of the other contracting party was neither recognised nor even indirectly admitted.

Incidentally it may not be out of place to point out that the author has shown that on many points there was no uniform Islamic law, the four schools of orthodox Muslim law having taken different views, that the Muslim states have often acted differently from the strict Islamic law and that they could always find plenty of jurists to justify their actions.

Dr. Khadduri has, however, as he himself admits, left his book rather incomplete. He has limited his study to the period covering the first four centuries of the Islamic era. Thus the period of the Crusades in which the rules of war and peace would provide the most interesting study has been left out. Besides he has confined himself to the Eastern Caliphate, taking no account of Spain, where in actual practice the non-Muslim communities were treated very differently from that in the East. For instance, the *Dhimmis* were not allowed to be governed by their own religious heads and the rulers violated their solemn pledges and treaty obligations to them. The campaigns against the Christians of Leon and Navarre were not preceded by an invitation to Islam nor were the rules regarding the non-combatants during the campaigns strictly adhered to.

A. F. M. KHALILUR RAHMAN

ANCIENT VIJÑAPTIPATRAS (Śrī Pratāpasiṃha Mahārāja Rājyābhiṣeka Granthamālā, Memoir No. 1) by Jñānaratna Dr. Hirananda Sastri, M.A., M.O.L., D.Litt; Baroda State Press, 1942; pages 80 with 28 plates.

The *paryuṣaṇā* which is the most important festival of the Jains lasts for eight days from Bhādrapada *badi* 12. The concluding day of the *paryuṣaṇā* is called the *sāṃvatsarika* with which the Jain religious year begins. The Jains are required to seek pardon for their sins on this auspicious day either orally or through letters, and these letters intended to solicit forgiveness are known as *kṣamāpaṇā, tīpaṇā* or *vijñaptipatra.*

In the volume under review the learned author has examined the historical value of a number of late medieval *vijñaptipatras* which are associated with the Kathiawar-Gujarat region. The letters were chiefly meant

for inviting a Jain *ācārya* to stay with a Jain Saṅgha of a particular locality during the next *caumāsā,* i.e., the four months of the rainy season when touring is not allowed to Jain monks, and incidentally refer to the acts of omission and commission of the members of the Saṅgha. The size of the *vijñaptipatras,* which are written on thick country paper, varies. One belonging to 1409 A.D. is said to be no less than 108 cubits in length. Some of these are not merely letters, but can without hesitation be called *khaṇḍa-kāvyas* (cf. the *Indudūta* of Vinayavijaya). The records furnish the description of localities mentioned and of the rulers of the country, with occasional allusions to local events, and are therefore valuable for local history. Sometimes we get in them interesting details regarding arts and crafts as well as social and religious customs. They are also useful for the study of Indian linguistics.

In the very interesting monograph under review, Dr. Sastri has given an account of no less than 24 such *vijñaptipatras;* but the actual text, with Gujarati and English translation, of only one of them has been quoted. This important record relates how Vivekaharṣa and Udayaharṣa, disciples of Vijayasenasūri, led a deputation in the company of Rājā Rāmadāsa to the Mughal emperor Jahāngīr at Agra and succeeded in getting an imperial *farmān* in 1610 A.D. prohibiting animal slaughter during the *paryuṣaṇā* days.

In an Appendix, the learned author has not only quoted the text of some well-known letters from classical Sanskrit literature, but also that of a document (regarding the purchase of a slave) from the *Lekhapaddhati* which gives the record a date corresponding to 1231 A.D. Dr. Sastri (p. 69) however flatly assigns the celebrated author Kṣemendra to the 7th century, without attempting to disprove the accepted and true date of the author which falls in the 11th century A.D.

The book under review contains a useful index and a large number of beautiful representations of paintings and drawings found on the *vijñaptipatras.* The illustrations are of exceptional interest to the student of Indian painting in the age of the Great Mughals.

Dines Chandra Sircar

TOPOGRAPHICAL LIST OF TRAVANCORE INSCRIPTIONS by R. Vasudeva Poduval, B.A.; published under the authority of the Government of Travancore; Government Press, Trivandrum, 1941; pages 341.

The list of Travancore inscriptions in the volume under review has been prepared with care. The plan is simple. The epigraphs have been enlisted according to their findspots which have been alphabetically arranged. No chronological or serial arrangement has been attempted. Informations regarding the records have been given in a tabular form under the heads *Number, Place of Inscription, Dynasty, King, Date, Language and Alphabet,* and *Remarks.* The number refers to that of the epigraphs belonging to a particular locality.

No very early epigraph has been discovered in the Travancore State. The records noticed in the volume are not of special interest to the general student of Indian history. But they are certainly of great value to those who are interested in the cultural and institutional history of Dravidian India, especially the Far South. There is a number of inscriptions belonging to great Tamil kings like Rājarāja I Coḷa, Rājendra I Coḷa and Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya; these are indispensable even for the political history of the country. References such as that to the Sucīndram-sabhā (p. 164, No. 15 of Parakkai) is important to the student of temple organisation in ancient and medieval India. The Muḷam of Tiruvattaru (p. 13, No. 3 of Aṅkamāli) reminds us of passages like *śivacandra-hasta* in early Bengal inscriptions.

Inspite however of the merits of the work under review, we feel that scholars would have been more grateful to Mr. Poduval if he could follow the method adopted in Bhandarkar's *List of Inscriptions of Northern India.* A serious drawback of the present .work is that it has no index—not even a list of the findspots of epigraphs or of the kings referred to in them. There is no map showing the situation of findspots and not a single explanatory note indicating the importance of anything written under the head *Remarks.* North Indian scholars would have been more grateful to the author if he could have avoided in all-cases printing ordinary words and proper names in Dravidian script. As for instance, the name of the festival Āṭittiruvōṇam (i.e. Tiruvōṇam in the mouth of Āṭi) has been given (p. 3, No. 4 of Aḍūr) in Tamil script rather unnecessarily. The author again would have earned our gratitude if he could give English equivalents for the Kollam dates in all the cases. We have noticed several misprints, e.g., in the equation of Kollam year 84 to A.D. 1667 (p. 11, No. 9 of Aṅkamāli). We beg to draw the attention of the arduous author to these points, as they may be easily removed in the future edition of the work.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

ANNEXATION OF BURMA by A. C. Banerjee, M.A., P.R.S. Published by A. Mukherjee & Bros. Pp. 338.

Prof. A. C. Banerjee, author of "The Eastern Frontier of British India" which was published in September, 1943, has with astonishing rapidity published its companion volume *Annexation of Burma*. As in the first volume, he has dealt with the subject from the British Indian point of view. It covers the period of Anglo-Burmese relations from 1826-'86 and completes the story of the annexation of Assam and Burma to the British Empire.

This volume has the same pleasing features that characterised the first—a very detailed topography, excellent maps and an entertaining narrative. It is a pity that the Burmese point of view does not find full expression in British records. Amherst, Dalhousie, Dufferin and their lieutenants, who were responsible for this phase of British Imperial expansion, must share the blame for this lack of knowledge which has handicapped historical investigations and perhaps British administration in Burma as well. These expansionists would have done British Imperialism a great service if they had attempted to understand the point of view of the conquered people instead of concerning themselves only with commercial convenience, imperial prestige and intrigues of foreign nations. In 1836, the Emperor of China communicated his sentiments regarding Article 7 of the Treaty of Yondabo which provided for a British Resident at the Durbar. He wrote—"It is not proper to allow the English to remain in the city. They are accustomed to act like the Pipal tree. Let not younger brother therefore allow the English to remain in the city." As we read the story of the annexation of Burma we become inclined to endorse the view of the leading article of the *Times* of the 3rd February, 1852, that good reason is never wanted for a fresh advance. A careful study of this book will give a very good idea of the causes of Burmese failure, *viz.*, bad leadership and lack of co-operation.

N. K. Sinha

RAJPUT STUDIES by A. C. Banerjee, M.A., P.R.S. Published by A. Mukherjee & Bros. Pp. 340.

This book contains the following papers—Early History of the Guhilots, Struggle between Delhi and Mewar in the thirteenth century, Rana Sanga of Mewar, Political and Military organisation of the Rajputs in the days of

Tod, British Alliance with Mewar, British Alliance with Jaipur, British Alliance with Marwar, British Alliance with Minor Rajput States.

The first three papers discuss important topics of the medieval period of Indian history. The fourth describes Rajput political and military systems when they came into contact with British Imperialism. The remaining papers deal with the relations of the East India Company with the Rajput States. The author depends for his first four papers on inscriptions, coins and chronicles. For his contributions to the modern period he has to depend on unpublished official documents in the Imperial Record Dept. Mr. Banerjee has a facile pen and his papers are very readable. The problems of medieval Indian history are discussed in a very convincing manner and a student of the nineteenth century history of India should know that unless he reads the last four chapters of this book he leaves a gap in his knowledge of the period.

N. K. Sinha

LIṄGADHĀRAṆACANDRIKĀ OF NANDIKEŚVARA. Edited with introduction, translation and full notes by M. R. Sakhare, M.A., T.D. (Cantab), Professor of Sanskrit and Education, Lingaraj College, Belgaum. Published by the author pp. xxiv + 682 + 76 + 104 + 250 + 20.

The Vīraśaivas or the Liṅgayats occupy an important position among Hindus in South India. They have rich literature in Sanskrit as well as in Kanarese which deal elaborately with the rituals and philosophy of the faith they follow. But unfortunately these are little-known among scholars outside the sect.[1] And it is gratifying to note that of late systematic attempts are being made to bring to light various old texts[2] and a number of scholars belonging to the sect have set themselves to the task of propagating the doctrines of the faith through treatises in English.[3]

1 There is little reference to them in the histories of Indian Literature and Philosophy. We find only sketchy accounts of the sect in the works of Wilson (*Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus*, Calcutta, 1846, pp. 142-7) and Farquhar (*Modern Religious Movements in India*, pp. 301-3).

2 Mention may be made in this connection of the works published in the *Vīraśaivaliṅgibrāhmaṇadharmagranthamālā*.

3 Of these the place of honour may be given to *A Handbook of Vīrasaivism* by S. C. Nandimath (Dharwar, 1942). Reference may also be made to the *Social*

In the volume under review we have a critical edition, accompanied by a long introduction, English translation, notes and appendices, of the first part of a late Sanskrit work of the Lingayats, based on two manuscripts and a little-known printed edition. The work seeks to show that the practice of carrying the Liṅga as observed by the Lingayats is sanctioned by Brahmanical texts occurring in the Vedas, Āgamas, Purāṇas and Smṛtis. Variants from the manuscripts as well as the printed edition are recorded but unfortunately the manuscripts are nowhere properly described.

It is rather strange that the learned editor has chosen to omit as being of less importance the second part of the work which, it is stated, 'has established the burial of the dead on the authority of Vedic and Smṛti texts.'

The long and rather diffuse introduction covering about seven hundred pages (which with certain minor modifications should have been issued as an independent volume) traces the origin and development of Śaivism and refers to the characteristic features of the Lingayat school and its literature in Kanarese as well as in Sanskrit. The appendices quote extracts from a number of other works elucidating different aspects of the philosophy of the school. An appendix giving a list of the numerous works quoted and referred to in the text would have been welcome. The inquisitive reader would also greatly appreciate any attempt at tracing the quotations in at least the published works as far as practicable. 'The many misprints appearing all through the book' for which the learned editor expresses his apology in the preface should have been corrected in an errata-appended to the volume. Inspite, however, of the minor defects mentioned above the book will be useful to scholars eager to be familiar with the interesting tenets of the Lingayats. We hope other scholars will follow with real scientific editions of the various Sanskrit texts of the sect.

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI

structure of the Veerasaiva Saints edited by M. Manjappa Hardekar (Dharwar, 1940) and *A Discourse on Veerasaivism* by T. H. M. Sadasivayya (Bellary, 1927). The first of these works gives a chronological account of the Kanarese literature of the school, but no such account of the Sanskrit literature is known to have been attempted so far.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute,
vol. XXIV, pts. III & IV (July-October, 1943)

A. S. ALTEKAR.—*Was there a Rāṣṭrakūṭa Empire in the 6th Century A.D.?* The writer of the paper is not inclined to accept the evidence adduced in support of the theory that there existed in the Deccan from about 475 A.C. a large Rāṣṭrakūṭa empire which was later on conquered by the Cālukyas in the 6th century A.C. The Cālukyas in fact overthrew the Nalas, Mauryas, Kaḷacūris and the Kadambas, but not the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, whose empire, it is stated, could not have been in existence in the 6th century.

P. K. GODE.—*Sābāji Pratāparāja, a Protégé of Burhān Nizām Shah of Ahmadnagar, and his Works—between A.D. 1500 and 1560.* Pratāparāja, the reputed author of the *Paraśurāmapratāpa,* a voluminous work in 16 kāṇḍas dealing with the general topics of Dharmaśāstra, has been identified in the paper with Sābāji, who is referred to in the *Burhān-i-Masir* (*History of the Nizamshahi Kings of Ahmadnagar*) as wrongly credited with bringing about a conciliation between Sultan Bahadur Shah of Gujarat and Burhān Nizām Shah of Ahmadnagar. Sābāji, who was in the employ of Burhān, is said to have been rewarded by his master for this service with the title of Pratāp Rāi. The author was a devotee of Paraśurāma and is known to have composed, besides the *Paraśurāmapratāpa,* two other works—the *Bhṛguvaṃśamahākāvya* and the *Bhārgavārcanacandrikā,* the former being a poem delineating the glories of Paraśurāma's family and the latter a treatise on the details about his ritualistic worship.

LUDWIK STERNBACH.—*Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law.* Dealing with the joint responsibility for debts contracted either by husband or the wife, the writer of the article points out stages in the development of women's right to property.

G. C. BASU.—*Nasalisation in Middle Indo-Aryan*

A. P. KARMARKAR.—*The Fish in Indian Folklore and the Age of the Atharvaveda.* That the fish played an important rôle in the socio-religious life of ancient India is shown by an analysis of the legends of the fish believed to have been recorded in the Mohenjodaro inscriptions

and the stories of the fish found in the different Purāṇas. The accounts of the Great Flood (with the Fish acting as the saviour) narrated in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, the *Atharvaveda*, and the *Mahābhārata* are discussed in the paper with the suggestion that the incident of the Flood took place just after the Bhārata war destroying the Indus Valley civilization, and later, after the lapse of a century, formed into a definite legend finding place in those works.

D. D. VADEKAR.—*The Concept of Sthāyibhāva in Indian Poeties.* After a scrutiny of the various descriptions of sthāyibhāva as found in the works of Sanskrit poetics, the conclusion has been reached in the paper that the nature of sthāyibhāvas is essentially similar to that of the Instincts or Propensities which are recognised in modern psychology as the basic constituents of human nature.

K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA.—*Same Rare Works in the Anup Sanskrit Library.* The following works found in the Anup Sanskrit Library of Bikaner have been described:

(1) *Rājapraśnīyanāṭyapadabhañjikā of Padmasundara* is a running commentary on the Jaina work *Rājapraśnīya*.

(2) *Jahāṅgīravinodaratnākara of Rāya Paramānanda.* This is an astronomical treatise by Rāya Paramānandarāya, son of Vāsudeva, a protégé of Jahangir.

(3) *Hanumangarh Fort Inscription.* This inscription on a stone in Persian script and language records the fact that the Hanumangarh Fort in the Bikaner State was built by Rāya Manohararāya during the reign of Jahangir.

(4) *Vṛtti on the Ṛgvedasarvānukramaṇī.* This is a Kannaḍa commentary on the *Ṛgvedasarvānukramaṇī* by Bhairavabhaṭṭopādhyāya.

Brahmavidyā, vol. VIII, pt. I

H. S. OLCOTT.—*The Civilisation that India needs* (from an address delivered at Tuticorin on 22nd October 1881). By civilisation, the writer meant "that state of society in which intellectual enlightenment is attended by the highest moral development, and where the rights of the individual and the welfare of the people as a whole are equally and fully realised."

P. K. GODE.—*The Chronology of Vijñānabhikṣu and his Disciple Bhāvā Gaṇeśa, the Leader of the Citpāvan Brāhmins of Benares* (Between A.D. 1525 and 1600). The writer brings together all the references to Bhāvā Gaṇeśa Dīkṣita and shows that Rāmakṛṣṇa Bhāve, the grandfather of Bhāvā Gaṇeśa, or his father migrated to Benares from Konkan in the 16th century, and that the date of Bhāvā Gaṇeśa, should be placed between 1550 and 1600 A.D. while that of his guru Vijñānabhikṣu between 1525 and 1580 A.D.

K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA.—*The Īśvaragītābhāṣya of Sabhāpatimiśra and the Aṣṭapadopaniṣad.*—*Īśvaragītā* is a part of the Uttarakhaṇḍa of the *Kūrmapurāṇa.* It is an imitation of the *Bhagavadgītā* with the attempt to show that Śiva is superior to Viṣṇu. The object of this paper, however, is not to deal with the text of the *Īśvara Gītā* but to notice a commentary on it by Sabhāpatimiśra. The writer gives extracts from the beginning and end of the commentary. In this commentary (foll. 34-35), he has found a quotation from the Upaniṣad called *Aṣṭapadā.* This quotation is given in *extenso.*

H. G. NARAHARI.—*An Early Ms. of the Kṛṣṇakarṇāmṛta of Bilvamaṅgala.* The writer gives a detailed description of the Ms.

Portions of the following serial publications appear in this issue:—

(i) Viṣṇusmṛti with the commentary of Keśavavaijayantī
(ii) Jīvānandanam of Ānandarāya Makhin
(iii) Sphoṭavāda of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa
(iv) Vaiṣṇavopaniṣads (translation)
(v) Horāśāstra of Varāhamihira
(vi) Acyutarāyābhyudaya of Rājanātha Ḍiṇḍima
(vii) Ārya Śālistambasūtra

Journal of the Bihar Research Society, vol. xxix, pt. iv, Dec., 1943

S. A. SHERE.—*A Wasli of Prince Khurram.* The writer, who happens to be the Curator of the Patna Museum, discovered on the reverse of an old valuable painting a panel containing excellent Persian calligraphy (7″ × 4″) of Prince Khurram (= Emperor Shāh Jahan), comprising four verses on love and the supreme moment of life. The writer believes that Prince Khurram not only wrote the verses by his own hand but also composed them. Incidentally, the writer throws some light on the early life of the prince.

BHUPESH CHANDRA MUKHERJI.—*The Reconstruction of Assam in 1826.*— The Burmese Kings overran almost the whole of Assam and even threatened Chittagong. This led to the First Anglo-Burmese war (1826) in which the Burmese were repulsed. The task of reconstructing the government of the province was entrusted to David Scott. Assam was divided into two regions, Lower and Upper. The Lower Assam was placed directly under the control of the Company while the Upper Assam was made over to Purandar Singha on certain conditions. A detailed account of the administrative system of the two divisions is given in this paper.

S. P. VARMA AND D. S. TRIVEDA.—*Vīra Vairāgi Laskarī.* The Vīra or Pīr Vairāgī Laskarī is an obscure and little known sect of the Vaiṣṇavas. They took up arms for the defence of the country and religion. The Laskarīs trace their origin to Bālānanda, the 12th in descent from Rāmānanda, who advocated the philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita in agreement with Rāmānuja. They became active in the 18th and 19th centuries, and had six important monasteries in Bihar.

MORESHWAR DIKSHIT.—*A new Inscription of Aparāditya (II) Śaka 1106.*— This inscription was probably discovered at Loṇaḍ, near Kalyan in the Bombay Presidency. It refers to the reign of the Silāhāra king Aparāditya (II) and records the gift of an orchard and several other contributions to the Vyomeśvara temple by the Minister Vyomaśambhu. Its date is 5th Nov. A.D. 1184. The writer throws some light on the minister Bhopaka Vyomasambhu, on Pāruthi 'drammas' (type of currency), and on the geography of the places mentioned in the inscription.

W. G. ARCHER AND SANKTA PRASAD.—*Bhojpurī Village Songs.* Collected from Kayasth households in Shahabad district, Bihar, 1940-41. Continued

New Indian Antiquary, vol. VI, no. 8, Nov. 1943

K. M. MUNSHI.—*The Historical Value of Paraśurāma Tradition.* The late Dr. Sukthankar held that "the *Mahābhārata* was a Bhṛgu epic and that the background of Bhṛgu exploits and traditions had been introduced into the history of the Pāṇḍavas." He also held that "the story of the Pāṇḍavas was historic and the Bhārgava episodes were the result of associations connected with the authors." The writer of this paper first

shows the four stages of growth of a historical tradition, and then establishes the historicity of Paraśurāma and localises him in the west coast of India down to Malabar. He then goes into the question of chronology and arranges the chronological landmarks thus:—I. The battle of ten kings, II. The close of the Vedic period. Conquest of Māhiṣmatī by Paraśurāma. III. The death of Paraśurāma and the rise of Kuru power in Madhyadeśa, IV. The Bhārata war, V. The reign of Janamejaya Pārikṣita, VI. The composition of the *Brāhmaṇas*. The reign of Adhisīmakṛṣṇa when the Purāṇas were recited, VIII. The birth of Gautama Buddha. The writer thinks that Paraśurāma was near the Ist landmark and lived up to the IIIrd, and concludes that "the legends of Paraśurāma represent the first phase of Aryan advance up to Narmadā on the one hand and the boundaries of Magadha on the other."

V. RAGHAVAN.—*A short note on the Rudraḍamarūdbhavasūtravivaraṇa.*

S. L. KATORE.—*Lakṣmīdhara's Vratakāṇḍa:* Recovery of a missing section of the *Kṛtyakalpataru.*

E. P. RADHAKRISHNAN.—*Gaṅgāpurī Bhaṭṭāraka, an Advaitin.* In this paper the writer compares the references to Gaṅgāpurī from the commentators Sukhaprakāśa and Pratyaksvarūpa, and concludes therefrom that Gaṅgāpurī flourished after Ānandānubhava and before Citsukha, between *c.* 1150 and 1200 A.C. and that he wrote a *bhāṣya* on Ānandānubhava's *Padārthatattvanirṇaya.*

SURESH CHANDRA BANERJI.—*The Sambhandhaviveka of Bhavadeva Bhaṭṭa.* This work is critically edited for the first time with English translation and notes.

Visvabharati Quarterly, vol. IX, pt. 3

N. C. GHOSH.—*Medieval Poet Saints of India.*—The writer points out the importance and excellence of the writings of some of the medieval Saints of India, who appeared at the time of the advent of Moslems in India. He speaks of the life and philosophy of Rāmānanda and Kabir in detail and refers to the faith of Guru Nanak, Dadu (of Dadupanthis), Mīrā Bai, Tulsi Das, Vidyāpati and Caṇḍīdas. He concludes by saying that in the teaching of all these saints, there is a basis of universal brotherhood.

PRABODH CHANDRA SEN.—*The Religious Policy of Aśoka.* The writer endeavours to establish that Aśoka might have had a Buddhist faith but he did not, for that reason, try to thrust it on his subjects. He preached an ethical religion, which was acceptable to people of other creeds. The writer reproduces R.E. No. 12 and shows therefrom how impartial and tolerant he was to all religious teachers. It would be wrong to say, he adds, that Aśoka engaged his Dharmamahāmātras for preaching Buddhism. The essence of his religion was 'obedience to parents, teachers and elders, due respect and liberality towards Brāhmaṇas and Śramaṇas, courtesy towards friends and relatives, kind treatment of slaves and servants, toleration for and appreciation of creeds other than one's own and kindness towards living creatures and consequent abstention from sacrificial slaughter of or physical violence to them, truthfulness, compassion, liberality, gratefulness, mastery over the senses, and purity of mind."

J. K. MEGHANI.—*The Folk Literature of Gujerat.* The writer offers here three types of Garba dance songs, the first giving vent to the sufferings of the women of Gujerat, the second representing favourable songs of sailors' wives, and the third comprising the ballads of street-singers.

KSHITIMOHAN SEN.—*Locana Paṇḍita's Rāgataraṅginī and its Historical Importance.*

Obituary Notice

Theodor Ippolitorich Scherbatsky

News has reached us of the sad death of Prof. Scherbatsky of Lenningrad in the memorable seige of the winter of the year 1941-42.

Prof. Scherbatsky, a son of a Government official representative of Russia, was born at Keltse in Poland in 1866, although his ancestral property was in the vicinity of St. Petersburg. After his education at school, he became a student of St. Petersburg University, where he had the benefit of attending lectures on Indology by Minayeff and Oldenberg. From 1888, he began to study Alaṅkāra with Bühler and after the session of the Congress of Orientalists in Rome in 1899, he became a student of Prof. Jacobi at Bonn. He studied Indian Philosophy there. He had the benefit of first hand contact with the Buddhist Lamas of Mongolia for whom he had a very high regard for their deep knowledge of Buddhist Logic and Buddhist Philosophy. He began to find in Dharmakīrti an "Indian Kant." In 1903, he published in Russian his *Theory of Knowledge and Logic*. He later took up Tibetan studies. In order to imbibe in him the Indian atmosphere for the better understanding of Indian philosophical literature, he thought it necessary to pay a visit to India in 1910-11, when he visited, it is reported, Bombay, Mahabaleshwar and Calcutta. He read with an Indian Pandit in Bombay. After the conflagration of Russian Revolution of 1917, he lost all his ancestral property. He went to Lenningrad and became all engrossed in Buddhist studies which he carried on at the Academy of Sciences until his death.

He was a bachelor until only last two or three years of his life. His jovial temper with a giant figure was always a centre of attraction to orientalists, old and young, who flocked to the Asiatic Museum of the Academy to listen to his inspiring talk. We will always associate the name of Prof. Scherbatsky with Radloff, Oldenberg, Stäel Holstein, Rosenberg, scholars of older generation, as well as with Ostrikoff, Obermiller and Dr. Tubiansky, representatives of the younger generation of scholars.

Although his books do not reveal a close study of Pāli sources, he was, no doubt, considered as one of the greatest exponents of Buddhist philosophy to the people of the West. His *Central Conception of Buddhism* (1923), and the most scholarly Introduction to his *Conception of Nirvana* (1927) and

his books on *Indian Logic* (1930-32) have proved his ability to be the interpreter of Buddhist philosophy to the Western people of Europe and America. His work on the *Abhidharmakośa* of Vasubandhu, as well as his association with Obermiller on *Abhisamayālaṅkāra* will always be remembered by students of Buddhism.

His loss, indeed, has been an irreparable one and it will be long before the void caused by his death will be filled in.

P. V. BAPAT

Printed and published by J. C. Sarkhel, at the Calcutta Oriental
Press, Ltd., 9, Panchanan Ghose Lane, Calcutta.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Kingship and Kingly Administration in the Atharvaveda ... 105
By Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., PH.D.

Early Nineteenth Century Chinese Studies in Bengal ... 114
By Dr. Elmer H. Cutts, PH.D.

The Date of Caitanya-Caritāmṛta of Murāri Gupta 132
By Biswaranjan Bhaduri, M.A.

British Policy towards the Afghan War of Succession (1863-68) 143
By Prof. A. C. Banerjee, M.A.

Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kānyakubja and their Migration to Marwar ... 153
By M. L. Mathur, M.A.

Early Industrial Organisation in North India 167
By Atindra Nath Bose, M.A.

Miscellany:

The Viṣṇu-stuti and Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta 179
By Dr. S. K. De, M.A., D.LITT.

Vajraṭa 181
By Dr. N. Venkataramanyya, M.A., PH.D.

Rāmabhadras of Bengal 188
By Prof. Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya, M.A.

Reviews:

Jñānadīpikā 193

Sukthankar Memorial Edition, vol. I:
Critical Studies in the Mahābhārata 193

Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, vol. V.
V. S. Sukthankar Memorial Volume 193
By Dr. S. K. De, M.A., D.LITT.

The Philosophy of Aesthetic Pleasure 199
By Prof. Chintaharan Chakravarti, M.A.

Śrī-Venkaṭeśa-Kāvyakalpa 200

Usāniruddham 200

Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts, vol. I. ... 201

PAGE

Tiloya-Pannatti of Yativṛṣabhācārya 201
By Dr. M. Ghosh, M.A., PH.D.

A History of Gingee and its Rulers 202
By Prof. A. C. Banerjee, M.A.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals: 203

Obituary Notices:

Prof. Carlo Formichi 208

Prof. Heinrich Lüders 209
By Dr. Manomohan Ghosh, M.A., PH.D.